

THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL,

OF

Politics and General Literature.

VOL. V.]

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16. 1822.

[No. 222.

SUMMARY OF NEWS.

—193—

Politics of Europe.

London, Wednesday, May 1, 1822.—Paris Journals of Sunday, arrived last night. The recess of the Chambers has stripped them of their only authentic articles of intelligence—viz. their Parliamentary reports; but it has not suspended the activity of their invention. We need scarcely observe, that whether with regard to Spain or Turkey, their statements are seldom worthy of the slightest notice. The private correspondence of the JOURNAL DES DEBATS, however, announces that M. De Tatischeff was, on the 19th or 20th of April, to quit the Austrian capital; and that the result of the refusal by the Court of Vienna to receive a certain note from the Reis Efendi was expected to be known towards the end of last month. The writer of the above letter adds, curiously enough, that the Turks undergo but two changes of temper, viz. from the extreme of phlegm to that of fanaticism: in the first state of mind, they negotiate with unreasonable violence; in the latter, they put a stop to negotiation by not speaking or writing at all.

Yesterday we received papers from Rio de Janeiro to the 23d of February. They contain several official documents, which serve to explain some of the political arrangements which have been adopted in consequence of the late revolution in the Brazils. The most important proceeding arises out of a letter dated February 4, addressed by the Camara or Magistracy of Rio de Janeiro to the Prince Regent, recommending the establishment of a Representative Junta. In this letter they state that it will contribute greatly to the advantage of the whole Portuguese nation, and in particular to Brazil, to create a junta composed of two representatives or attorneys (Procuradores) for each of the greater provinces, and one for each of the less, to be chosen by the parochial electors; the duty of these representatives to be to advise his Royal Highness on affairs of importance, to propose such measures as they may judge necessary, and to watch over and defend the interests of their respective provinces. On the 16th, the Prince Regent issued a decree complying with this recommendation. The decree regulates the mode of election, and directs that provinces which have four deputies in the Cortes, shall choose one representative for the Junta; those which have from four to eight, two; and those which have more than eight, three. It is provided, that in case the representatives do not duly attend to the interests of their respective provinces, they may be removed by their constituents. The Prince Regent is to preside in this Junta, which is called the Conselho de Procuradores. The Camara of Rio de Janeiro addressed another letter of the same date to the Prince Regent, requesting that the law for regulating the liberty of the press might be carried into execution, “as the absolute liberty of printing, in the existing state of Brazil, might degenerate into mischievous abuses.” But nothing is said of any measure having been adopted in consequence of this application. These papers also contain an order, addressed in the name of the Prince Regent, to the Provisional Government of Pernambuco, on the subject of the troops expected to arrive from Portugal in that province. The Provisional Government is directed, in case these troops should arrive, to make them return, but to give them refreshments and to supply them with every thing necessary for their voyage back to Europe.

There are topics on which the heart shrinks from dwelling, and the present state of the south of Ireland is one. Famine has there succeeded at length to the calamities endured in ordi-

nary seasons by a wretched and despairing race of men: tens of thousands of families are exposed to its worst horrors; and while men in office are thinking about arrangements by which that which ought to have been foreseen and prepared against six months ago may be tardily checked in the latter stages of its course, the miserable tenant of the bog or mountain district throughout the wider portion of the south of Ireland, expires amidst the screams and agonies of his little ones, perishing of the same hunger which destroys him. Dreadfully are now superseded those duties of which no Irish Government has hitherto performed more than half. The starved offender receives the final punishment of his crimes, and the innocent is saved from the certainty of future sufferings. Details have reached us which we forbear to force upon our readers; but in the bare outline of such a picture, there lies an appeal to the humanity of the English people, which it is not in their nature to disregard. We have seen a short printed address to the country, circulated by a benevolent individual, with a view to hasten and extend some measures of spontaneous relief for our unhappy (though they should be our deluded) fellow-subjects in the provinces of Munster and Connaught. The document proceeds from 29, Lombard-street, where subscriptions are received. The concurrence of private persons in this pious undertaking may act successfully upon the Ministers, to whose functions it more properly belongs, by stimulating their zeal, or by making them ashamed of their indifference.

The effect of the Marquis of Londonderry's speech on Monday evening, (April 29,) on what may really be called the state of the nation, though agricultural distress was the technical subject of discussion, has not yet completely developed itself. People do not yet understand the bearing of so many measures proposed or threatened, and look in each other's faces for information. It would be presumptuous in us to pretend to instruct their ignorance: we may in some degree console the consciousness of it, by stating, that those who propose the measures in question, are probably in as great uncertainty respecting their tendency and practical result, as the most perplexed of those who look up for explanation. We shall, therefore, consider the subject, as we should any unexpected phenomenon of nature that might have occurred—a stone of immense magnitude and various colours fallen from the Heavens, or a chasm of great depth and various breadth opened in the earth—and shall discuss its probable operation on the world we live in, without passion or prejudice.

There is somewhat portentous in the acknowledged truth that the measures under recommendation are new, and that they spring from men, who, however they may appear when measured with those at present around or near them, are not, in talent, dignity, political consideration, to be compared with those whom we recollect. It is unfortunate, certainly, that the errors of great men should come to be corrected by little ones: but this is not wholly the fault of those on whom the present administration of affairs has alighted.

We hasten from general remarks to particular ones. Agricultural distress is the first subject under consideration, and for the relief of this, Lord Londonderry candidly acknowledges that he does not think any effectual remedy can be administered. He, however, proposes one, namely, “the advance of public money to farmers upon corn stored.” What weight this plan may have even in his Lordship's mind (we go no farther at present) is obvious from the consideration, that he had before op-

posed it in the committee as useless. "The ground (he says) on which he now *proposes* it, after having *opposed* it in the committee, is, that it tends to produce no unnatural or *artificial* change in the market;" that is, in reality, that it tends to produce no change at all! But change or none, there was certainly the same reason for objecting to the measure out of the committee as in it: and it would have been a most prodigious thing to find a minister, in any other times than the present, proposing and urging upon the House for its acceptance that measure, which in the committee he had declared to be improper, inadequate, and foolish. One really hardly knows what to say of a man that can do this, except that he does not know what to do; and having no proposition of his own to make, must accept and recommend that of others, though he knows it to be useless.

But, setting aside Lord Londonderry's objection to the measure which he himself brings forward for the abatement of agricultural distress, what, we ask, are its intrinsic powers of relief? He proposes to borrow of others, and to lend upon interest, and to be repaid at a certain time the sum of ONE MILLION. What! And is all the Agricultural distress reduced to this, that it can be relieved, or that it can be sensibly affected even, by the application of ten hundred thousand pounds upon such conditions? Alas! we believe and revere Scripture miracles: here are indeed the five barley loaves and two small fishes; but what are they among so many? One million, however, is to be lent to the farmers on the deposit of their grain, and another million to be expended in public works. Though the consideration of these two millions will with more propriety come under the following head, we shall here observe, that whatever interest the farmers may pay to Government in money, for the sum borrowed, they will do more than double that interest in the loss and decay of so perishable a commodity as corn, when placed and warehoused out of their own custody. The million applied to public works is employed directly and forcibly against them; for who are to be engaged in these works? Not the farmers themselves, but their labourers, a portion of whom (we rejoice in *any* thing that can better even their condition), but a portion of whom will thus be taken out of the market, and consequently the wages of the rest prevented from falling. Thus futile or mischievous are the measures proposed for the relief of agricultural distress. We turn to the financial part of the plan.

The first thing that strikes us in Lord Londonderry's speech upon this subject, is the following sentence:—"Two millions six hundred thousand pounds, which the Bank has liberally undertaken to advance in July next, at three per cent. interest, to satisfy those holders of five per cents. who had refused the terms offered by Government." This, of course, we are to borrow, to which we do not object; and thank the Fates that we are through this business—we say, in consequence of the just timidity of the public creditor. Two millions and a half, or a little more, is all that has proved necessary to satisfy the holders of one hundred and fifty millions of stock, who were unwilling to take a small bonus above four, instead of their full five per cent! All that we can say is, now the danger is over, that they were moderate, and we have been lucky: for where more than these two millions and a half could have been raised in the present state of the affairs of the public creditor, it exceeds mortal wit to conjecture.

But with respect now to the general state of our finances, and the increase or diminution of the national debt. The five millions, it appears, set apart under the title of a sinking fund, is to be religiously preserved. For argument sake, therefore, we will suppose the public debt diminished this year by that sum: but it is acknowledged on all sides that we have really no other sinking fund than that sum, be it more or less, by which our income exceeds our expenditure. On the one side, therefore, £6,000,000. is to be considered as deducted from our national debt; but on the other there is added to it—

Money to the holders of 5 per Cent.	£2,600,000
Borrowed for national works	1,000,000
Ditto for agricultural distress in England	1,000,000
Ditto for distresses in Ireland, sum uncertain, but estimated by Lord Londonderry at another million ..	1,000,000

£5,600,000

The diminution, therefore, of the national debt, by the proposed sinking fund, is five millions: and the addition to that debt is, even in this stage of our calculation, five millions six hundred thousand pounds; making a balance in favour of that good, old absorber of public wealth—the national debt—of the odd six hundred thousand pounds. We'll bet him against fifty thousand such financiers as Lord Londonderry and Mr. Vansittart, he'll swallow them all up by and by.

But even this is not all. It appears that we pay in "officers' pensions, retired allowances, pensions of officers' widows, " and half-pay, under the head of army, navy and ordnance " [vide Lord Londonderry's speech] the sum of five millions " annually." It is proposed to find purchasers for this decreasing series of annual payments; and the proposal is, that we shall give those purchasers 2,800,000. for five and forty years to come, on condition that they begin immediately to pay the pensions in question, amounting at present to five millions, and continue to pay them till the claimants are extinct by old age and death. Now it is clear, that whatever we pay less than the five millions at present is a sum added to our national debt, and which must be liquidated hereafter in no very provident manner. The contractors, therefore, this year pay the five millions, of which we advance £2,800,000; the national debt is consequently increased this year, (and that without taking into consideration the gains of the contractor upon the purchase,) by the sum of £2,200,000; which being added to the above sum of £600,000, makes a general addition to the national debt of two millions eight hundred thousand pounds—

The diminution by the sinking fund being	£5,000,000
Addition	7,800,000

Difference £2,800,000

What mockery, then, to talk of a sinking fund!

We have but little space to afford to the consideration of the joint stock companies, and the increased power to be conceded to country bankers of issuing one pound notes: suffice it to say that the real operation of these measures will be to frustrate the effects of Mr. Peel's Bill, and to substitute the paper of the country bankers for that of the Bank of England, which has been called in. But even this is not the worst of the proposition. Lord Londonderry justly states that the respectable country bankers are at present "trading within their credit." But what will be the consequence under the proposed measure? Why, that the respectable country bankers will still issue their one and two pound notes, under a salutary apprehension of being called upon for sovereigns or Bank of England bills; while the more desperate speculators will throw forth their trash in unrestrained profusion: so that we shall not only have country bank notes of one and two pounds instead of notes of the same value from the Bank of England, but we shall have country notes of the worst description obtruded upon us; which, indeed, from the decreased quantity of the circulating medium, will be but too readily accepted; but which, upon the occurrence of any panic, the issuers will be unable to exchange for gold, and the most dreadful confusion may consequently be apprehended.

We had forgotten, while speaking of the agricultural distress at the beginning of these remarks, to notice that Ministers, in violation of all their former reasonings, now mean to propose countervailing duties, instead of the present maximum. In arguing against the existing system, as his Lordship had before reasoned for it, Lord Londonderry talked of millions of quarters, three, four, and five, being imported; he considered corn thus imported like timber or iron, as an almost imperishable commodity. He talked of one influx of wheat as affecting the country "like a nightmare" for ages to come! Whereas grain is no sooner warehoused than it begins to suffer; and the incessantly diminishing quantity must be repeatedly screened and dressed to be preserved from damp and rot. These, however, are the absurdities, changes, and contradictions of one who really knows not what to do. We shall, of course, have more to say upon these measures in the detail, if they ever go into the detail.—*Times*.

Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1822.

CATHOLIC PEERS.

Mr. CANNING rose to submit his motion on this subject. The right hon. gent began by saying, that if he could in any way flatter himself with the hope of impressing on the minds of members the same conscientious conviction of the justice and expediency of the measure which he was about to recommend to the consideration of the house, he should approach the question with a feeling of confidence which he had never before experienced. If he now approached it with a mixed feeling of much agitation and much anxiety, it arose from this—that if it should be of doubtful success, which he hoped would not be the case, he had no refuge in the uncertainty of its justice, none in the paucity of argument which might be adduced in its support, but that the conviction would be, that a cause so unquestionably just must have been lost by the inability of its advocate. Before he proceeded to state the grounds on which he should call on the house for the removal of the disabilities under which the Roman Catholic Peers stood with respect to seats in Parliament, it might be expedient to advert to and get rid of some particular and preliminary objections which there and elsewhere were made, rather to the manner and form, than to the principle of the question: when he said elsewhere, he alluded to what passed in conversation out of doors. The first was an objection which had been repeated by the honourable member for Somersethire (Sir T. Lethbridge)—that this motion respecting the admission of Roman Catholic Peers was an insidious attempt to obtain a partial decision on the whole question: connected with that, and yet in contradiction to it, came another, which asserted that this separation of one class of that community from another went to prejudice the whole. Though he might in fairness set one of those contradictory objections to balance the other, yet he would offer a word or two on both. If the measure which he should propose were a step to advance the question, it would not prejudice it; but if it were an obstacle, as was thought, on the other hand, to the principle of the general measure, then it ought to be hailed with delight as against the success of the whole. In one sense he would admit, that the present would be an advantage to the general question; for, inasmuch as that question consists of two parts, the removal of one must necessarily be a deduction from its numerical difficulties. There was another and a more general sense in which the introduction of the present measure might be of advantage to the general question—it was the wide discussion which it would produce; for in this, as well as in all other cases founded in justice, frequent discussion was of vast importance, unless we could check the force of thought and interrupt the flight of time, for those, with the aid of discussion, brought us every hour nearer and nearer to the conviction of truth. (hear, hear.) In any other sense he denied that the present discussion could be considered objectionable. The present question had one great advantage—that it placed the decision on a more narrow and practicable basis, and did not involve so many difficulties, and such complicated considerations, as the more general measure. Hitherto it was objected to the advocates of the Roman Catholic question, that they did not confine themselves to the law and the facts—that they wandered into generalities, soared to the height of principles, and ranged in the wide fields of analogies, but that they did not adhere to the statute and the principles of the constitution. He trusted that before he concluded he should be able to show that the advocacy of the measure rested on more limited grounds. He would show his disposition to meet such objections by going on the very grounds from which it was said the advocates of the measure were accustomed to depart. He would meet the question on the ground of those acts alluded to, and, without undervaluing the general topics on the general measure, he would adhere to the principle of the notice he had given, and would go no farther towards that general principle, than, as he had observed, the result of discussion and the progress of consideration could tend to its advantage. There was another objection, coming from those who conceived that the present partial discussion would not be well received, as there were some who were so high-minded as to be indifferent to its progress unless it embraced the whole question, not because they thought that this partial concession would confer valueless privileges on those who were its objects, but that such a division would strip the cause of many of those topics of declamation which had hitherto been urged by its advocates. He, however, much as he admitted that discussion had served the cause, was not one of those who, to enrich future debates, would deprive himself of present advantage; and they who viewed the question in this light were, in his opinion, entirely mistaken: for if there was any value in such an objection, why not go back to the time when the penal code, with all its revolting inflictions, was in the full operation—when even the most jejune statements would be powerfully eloquent from the strength of the facts on which they were bottomed? How must those who thus objected lament the removal of so many disabilities from which the Roman Catholic was already released. How must they regret those periods from the beginning of the late reign up to the

present time, when the fetters of many years were taken off, and when little more than the mark of former chains was visible. (hear, hear.) He supposed these persons regretted the act of 1778, which restored to the Roman Catholics the right of property: he supposed they lamented the act of 1791, which removed so many vexatious disabilities: he supposed they deplored the measure of 1793, which gave to the Irish Roman Catholic so much political power, that what remained to be acquired seemed but trifling compared with what was granted, and that their sorrow was increased by the measure which, three years ago, silently opened the army and navy to Catholic enterprise. He supposed all these boons were lamented, because, if still denied, they would have formed the ground of a most impressive statement if thrown altogether. (hear, hear.) He need not say how differently he viewed the question in this respect, and how unwise he considered those who thought it could be better advocated on such grounds. But another objection was coupled with the above, and it referred to circumstances which entitled it to more respect. It was suggested that the noble persons involved in the present measure had some disinclination to its introduction, because it did not include those who were connected with them in the same religion. He gave those noble individuals credit for the most liberal feelings on this subject; but he would add, that he had never appeared in that house as the sworn advocate of the Roman Catholics (he might have used the word advocate before as applying to them, but it was in common parlance). He never defended them as such. He never sought for their approbation, or let his fear of their censure influence his opinions. Therefore, as he sought not their thanks or their praise, he would never defer to their opinions on any measure of parliamentary relief, especially in a case where they must be looked upon as so much interested. But he was relieved from any embarrassment on this part of the case, by a communication which he had that day received, and which he had authority to mention to the house; but he would not abuse that confidence. The letter he received came from an individual of the highest rank in the Peerage; and its conclusion was in these words—after alluding to the reports which had been circulated on the objections said to exist in the minds of the Roman Catholic lords—“I can assure you, and you may state on my authority, that such reports have no foundation.” He (Mr. Canning) was glad of this declaration, for the reports to which it referred had gone abroad, and had made some impression. Here he felt it necessary to state to a larger audience what he had before said in that house, and often in private—that as he did not, and would not, consult the feelings of the parties in question on this subject, so he would declare upon his honour that it was not suggested to him, directly or indirectly, by any of those interested in its issue. The responsibility was entirely his own; and if he called upon Parliament to legislate for those individuals, and his only difficulty was as to the paucity of their numbers, he did so with as little instigation as if he had asked to legislate for the whole Roman Catholic community, or the whole community of England. Another subject upon which in the outset he wished to offer a few words, was an objection which he had somewhere heard, that there was something peculiarly improper in originating in the House of Commons a measure which concerned the privileges of the House of Peers. That was a question which could only be viewed on the ground of precedent; and if he looked to precedent, he would find that the very bill which he now proposed to rectify had its origin in the House of Commons. The disqualification which it enacted was not one peculiar to the Commons, but to the Peers; and in looking at that bill (30th Charles II.) it was necessary to observe the then relative situations in which the Roman Catholic Peers stood with respect to the Catholic commoners. The commoners were already excluded by the oath of supremacy, but notwithstanding that oath the peers to whom it was not yet offered held their seats. If he found that this bill, while it imposed the oaths of transubstantiation and supremacy equally on Catholic peers and commoners, only confirmed the disability under which commoners had before laboured, but created for the peers one to which they had till then not been subjected—if such a measure originated with the House of Commons, in the name of common sense, what ground could there be for supposing, that as the Commons had originated the disability, they might not also originate the relief? (hear, hear.) But why need he confine himself to that particular case, when he had so many cases *part materia*. Why the act of 5th of Elizabeth originated with the House of Commons; the act for disqualifying the Bishops originated with that house; and the act for rehabilitating those Bishops owned the same source. When he had such precedents before him, what right had he to go farther, or what ground was there for maintaining for an instant, that there was something disrespectful to the other house in originating a measure in which their privileges were concerned? Was he hereafter to be told that it was disrespectful to them if the house originated a measure for the special relief of an alleged grievance? This last objection reminded him of another, which had been alluded to by the honourable member for Somersethire, in a speech so flattering to himself (Mr. Canning.). The honourable member had touched upon the inconsistency of his opposing reform in the House of Commons; while, at the same time, he introduced so large a principle of reform in the House

of Lords. This was the argumentum ad hominem, and might, perhaps, not have much weight there; but as he at all times held it important that the proposer of any measure should stand well in its motives before those to whom he proposed it, he would say a few words on that subject. It often happened that the very point on which a man piqued himself most, was that on which he was frequently accused. Now he (Mr. Canning) had really flattered himself, that instead of being inconsistent in the present motion, he was most consistent with every ground on which he had resisted reform. In opposing Parliamentary reform, he always stated that it behoved the proposer of such a measure, distinctly to define what his reform meant—whether it was to extend to the reconstructing the House of Commons anew, or restoring it to a particular state or condition, in which it was at some former period. If he were told it was the first, he would have the nature of the change and its grounds fully stated; if he were answered, that the proposer's object was the second he had named, he would inquire at what time the house was in such situation, how it had ceased to be so, and what were the nature and extent to which it was to be restored to its former condition. These he took to be necessary tests of any measure of reform; by all these tests was he willing to have his proposition tried; and to all these would he ready to answer. To the first he would answer, that his object was not to reconstruct the House of Lords, but to bring it back to the state in which it formerly existed, when Roman Catholic Peers took their seats as matter of right; and if asked to point out the period, he would say that it was up to the 30th of November, 1678, the day on which the Royal assent was given to the bill by which those peers were excluded; and to the other question he would reply, that by the ancient custom, such as it was from time immemorial, and by special statute, which existed for 112 years before 1678, Roman Catholic Peers had a right to a seat in the upper House of Parliament. He would say, that from time immemorial there was no impediment to this, and that in later times it had, for 112 years, been recognized by special statute, by which Roman Catholic Peers had been exempted from a particular oath. If questioned as to the extent to which this restoration of the House of Lords would go, he would reply, to admission of six English Catholic Peers, and by a possibility, at some future period, to the admission of the same number of Irish. He trusted he had now put his proposition to the tests to which every measure of reform ought to be submitted, and by which it ought to be judged; and that he had vindicated himself from the charge of inconsistency in supporting a reform in one house, whilst he opposed it in another. He had shown that his reform had those characters, without which none could be safe, or ought to be tolerated---that it was something known and defined, which brought the Constitution back to a state in which it had before existed, and he would show that, possessing all the advantages, it possessed none of the dangers which other kinds of reform could produce. For the present he had said enough to show that his measure was not an innovation, but a restoration; and he submitted that it would require strong counter arguments to show that he was in error. But he would go farther; he would show not only that his measure was not an innovation of any rights, but a restoration of rights founded upon principles of the strictest justice. He would show that the suspension of those rights arose from causes which no longer existed—that it was framed on pretences which were never true—that it was founded in injustice which could be hardly ever redeemed—that its means were marked with cruelty to those present, and an injustice to posterity, which scarcely ever attended confiscation and war. (cheers). If he should show this, he conceived he should have made out such a case as would remove many of the difficulties hitherto opposed to his measure, and fully establish that it was not founded in any unjust innovation on the rights of the House of Peers, but a restoration of the just rights of those noble individuals who were now excluded from that house. In order to arrive at a right notion of the state of this question, and of the proportion of the former laws to those which were yet unrepealed, it might be necessary to take a succinct view of the principal laws which had been enacted against the Roman Catholics. Gentlemen need not fear that he was going to trespass so far on their attention by an enlarged history of those transactions, but it was proper that they should be briefly touched, in order to clear the question and disentangle the argument, and to show that the practical maxims of antiquated prejudice could not and was not to be applied to the measures of government, when the alleged grounds of those prejudices had ceased to exist. The history of legislations as affecting the Roman Catholics might be divided into three periods—the first, dating from the Reformation, or, he would say from the 1st of Elizabeth to the restoration of Charles II.; the second, from the reign of Charles II. to the Revolution; and the third, from the Revolution to the reign of his late Majesty, when the relaxation of the penal code commenced. Gentlemen would see that this unequal division, as it was, in fact, of those periods, was justified by the difference in the principle of legislation which distinguished the second from the first. The severity of Elizabeth was caused, if not justified, by the plots which had been made against her crown and her life by the disquietude of one religion not altogether put down, and by the instability of another not wholly

established, and by the influence of foreign politics which connected an opposition to her belief with a refusal of allegiance to her authority. (hear.) At that period the throne and the religion were become so identified, that the existence of the one was thought to depend upon the establishment of the other. The severity therefore of any enactments which arose from such feelings could not excite surprise; the continuance of that severity was another point, and could not be justified unless the same cause were proved to exist. The next period to which he should come was the third—(passing the second for the present,)—the period of the revolution, when legislation against the Roman Catholics ceased: for after that period, except doubling the land-tax, there was no other enactment against Roman Catholics. The causes which operated against them at that period were a deposed and exiled monarch who was of the same religious belief, a disputed succession, and he might call it a divided dynasty. It was natural in such a turbulent period to unite politics with religion, and to look upon the one as a sort of test of the other. Looking at the political feelings of a large party amongst his new subjects, seeing the support which the discontented were likely to receive from foreign powers, and knowing the advantage which might be taken by the friends of his deposed predecessor, it was natural, he said, in such a case, that William III. should not have repealed any of the laws which he found had been enacted against the Roman Catholics in the reign of Charles II., and which were not yet 10 years old. His business was to keep down the religion of the exiled monarch, not to encourage the acquisition of property by those who, with that property, might assist his rival—to disarm the Papists, lest those arms might be wielded against himself—his business was to render them feeble and powerless, in order to render their favour for his rival ineffectual against himself; and in the example which had been set by the revocation of the edict of Nantes, he had a proof of the little disposition of some of the continental powers to favour the religion which he was so anxious to support. Taking those circumstances into consideration, it was natural to think that William would not be disposed to look with any kind of favour on his Catholic subjects in England. But in Ireland, where there was a much greater proportion of the people hostile to the Government; and favouring the cause of the deposed king, the system towards the Catholics was one of more unmixed severity. There the attempt was made to grind the people to the dust, to loosen the bonds of family and kindred, so as to make society almost untenable; but was this the wantonness or caprice of Protestants? No, but because the Protestant religion established in Ireland was less settled, and because an opposition to it was almost in every instance in that day connected with the support of a competitor for the crown. Setting aside both those periods, that of Elizabeth and of the Revolution, in the first of which there were so many causes connected with the safety of the religion and the throne for the enactment of penal statutes against Roman Catholics, and in the second when the same reasons prevailed against their repeal, the period of Charles II., to which he would now come, would be found insulated as far as this question was concerned. The enactments of that period derived no sanctity from the antiquated severities of Elizabeth, nor could they have any reference to the transactions of Wm. III. In that reign (of Charles II.) there was no internal struggle—no foreign enemy. There was no external danger. The measures of severity against the Roman Catholics, in that reign, did not descend from the Monarch, but ascended from the Parliament to the Throne. If honourable members would look at the history of the penal code with the same close attention with which he had been obliged to view it, they would be surprised to find what a small portion of legislative enactments against the Roman Catholics, except what was shot up within the reign of the Second Charles. They would find that in the reign of the late sovereign, almost the whole of the penal enactments had been repealed, except the 5th of Elizabeth, which was confirmed in the reign of Charles II. and the 13th of Elizabeth, prohibiting all communication with the See of Rome, which it was well known had fallen into disuse. He believed that these were nearly all which remained, except a statute of Queen Anne, which gave advowsons of livings possessed by Roman Catholics to the Universities, and some certain oaths put to Catholics entering the army and navy. But, as to these last, they were done away with by the act of 1817. Now he did not wish to affirm as the general proposition, for he would not say whether, in some corner of an obscure statute, there might not remain some penal clause which was not swept away by the act of 1791; but speaking generally, he believed he might say, that the whole of the penal enactments which remained against the Roman Catholics would be found to have been passed within the period of the reign of Charles II. He mentioned this for the purpose of narrowing the compass of the debate, and because the whole ground of the enactment lay within this restrictive circle. The period of Charles II. held by that which preceded and that which followed. It held with the preceding period upon this—that it extended the enactments of the 5th of Elizabeth from the Commons to the Lords, and it held by the period which followed in this, that in the revolution that act had not been repealed, but as hostility to the Roman Catholic religion was one cause of the revolution, so

PARLIAMENTARY.

—197—

it was continued to be a ground for future enactments if they should be considered necessary. Thus, then, the attention of the house would be chiefly confined to the reign of Charles II. To those who attended to the history of that period, it was not a matter of surprise that Charles, who was not avowedly, but secretly, a Catholic, and his brother, who was avowedly of that religion, had used the professors of that religion, if not to subvert the constitution, at least to dispense with some of its most important checks; and that, in consequence, Parliament should have looked with very great jealousy upon the prospect which they had of a Popish succession to the throne. In entering upon the transactions of this reign, he was aware that he was going upon the most debateable ground in history. The accounts of it given by writers at both sides were extremely partial; but without going the lengths of either party, he thought he might safely assert that the predominant feeling of the Parliament of that day was that of objection to a Popish successor. If that point was duly considered, it would throw light upon what would be otherwise obscure, and make that plain which would be otherwise complicated and difficult; would strip some of the measures of that day of the severity which otherwise would need apology. To this point was also to be referred the great object which the Parliament seemed to have in view, of debarring the Duke of York from the succession—an object very plainly evinced by their repeated remonstrances respecting him. These frequent remonstrances, and the many indications of ill will towards the Duke of York, which were then so repeatedly manifested, show that the Duke's religion was the danger they apprehended, and that the object they really aimed at was his exclusion, and to it they eventually came as the plain and direct remedy to meet the danger which they beheld in so alarming a light. When he stated these historical facts, and adverted to the heat which accompanied them, he did not mean to blame the transactions of these times, but to show the object the House of Commons had in view. These proceedings went on in their order. The test act (the 25th Charles II.) was introduced for the purpose of affecting all officers, civil and military, and compelling them, after the obligations of allegiance and supremacy, to make the declaration against transubstantiation within such and such a period. This was evidently aimed at the Duke of York, who was, he must repeat, the main object in all these measures, and it had the immediate and foreseen effect intended by its promoters, for he, the moment it was passed, laid down his office of Lord High Admiral of England, and also ceased at the same moment to be a minister of the Crown. This led to another statute (the 30th of Charles II.) introducing a still severer test. It contained a declaration, commonly called the declaration against Popery, denying transubstantiation, and asserting the sacrifices of the mass and other ceremonies of the Catholic religion to be superstitious and idolatrous; but its principal object was to exclude from both Houses of Parliament Peers or Commoners who refused to subscribe to this declaration. This act passed the Commons, met also some opposition in the House of Lords, where the Duke of York, not without some difficulty, succeeded in procuring an exemption in his favour from taking the declaration imposed by the bill. It was sent back with this exemption to the Commons, who passed it, leaving its operation to Papists in general; but upon finding the Duke had protected himself, then alone was the exclusion bill thought of, and to it they firmly came. While these matters were going on, the general alarm against Popery was widely spread, and the King was addressed against his marriage with a Catholic; but the great struggle first by the test act, then when the severer test failed to exclude from Parliament, and last of all the exclusion bill, was clearly directed against the Duke of York's succession to the crown. Rapin, who was an historian not likely to mistake or misstate the object for which the House of Commons was then struggling, in speaking of the great bearing of all these acts, said, that the exclusion of the Duke of York from the Crown was all along the governing motive of the Commons—that they attacked him step by step, and when all the smaller measures failed or were evaded, then they introduced the exclusion bill, which was the plain and palpable remedy. What inference did he (Mr. Canning) draw from this series of acts?—not that the Parliament of that day were wrong—not that the succession of the Duke of York ought not to have been guarded against as dangerous—but that this having been the real and undoubted danger which the Parliament provided against, and the existence of the penal enactments of that day could not be de creeded but on the same grounds of necessity. Where, then, now were these grounds? Where now was the Popish successor to the throne of these realms? (hear, hear.) Where was now the danger of Popish ascendancy within these realms; and if there be none in existence, were they now justified in retaining the same penal measures as their ancestors had framed, when all the danger was passed, and the only necessity for their existence long abandoned? (hear, hear.) In looking at these events, he did not mean to enter into a nice disquisition how far a political purpose did or did not morally justify the sacrifice to a national object of the rights of innocent individuals; that was a difficult question, and must be determined upon a view of the urgency of the particular case: neither did he mean to enter into the question of the guilt or innocence of the parties affected by the

measures he had stated. One of the peculiar circumstances of this case was, that he might, without touching his argument, grant either their guilt or their innocence—he might contend, *argumenti gratia*, that the necessity and the desire to get rid of the Duke of York's succession, either did or did not justify the extinction as a political body of the Catholic peerage. But should they who had not the pretence of the same danger idly and vexatiously contend for a continuance of the same remedy, and when called upon by reason and justice to permit a principle of exclusion now no longer necessary, still persevere in enacting a penalty, and convert a measure of temporary precaution at the time of its formation into a bill of wanton, permanent, and unjust exclusion? (hear, hear.) A careful perusal of the history of the reign of Charles II. would satisfy the house as to the governing principle of the exclusion. They could never fail to recollect the different attempts of the House of Commons to press upon the Lords measures of restriction and exclusion against a Popish successor. In the ferment of these times, came to the aid of the alarmists the memorable Popish plot, (hear, hear,) at a season which, as Mr. Home well observed, was peculiarly fit to seize on the fears and apprehensions of a people jealous to an extraordinary degree, and alive to every suspicion. The cry of a plot all on a sudden struck their ears and they, like men affrightened and in the dark, took every figure for a spectre. The terror of each man became the source of terror to another, and, an universal panic being diffused, reason and argument, and common sense and common humanity, lost all influence over them. As it was so much the custom, according to the prejudice of men's minds, to refer to the firm and efficient manner in which their ancestors had protected their liberties, and secured their transmission to their successors, he must call upon them to retract their steps for a century; and when they referred to the steps taken by the Parliament of Charles, he should like to know whether the mode adopted in 1678 was that which they would be disposed to select as one denoting the faulted wisdom of their ancestors. The Parliament of 1678 met on the 21st of October, and the King's speech at their opening only slightly alluded to the Popish plot. The Commons having, as heretofore stated, a great game to play, affected a great solicitude for further information; they sat day after day, and all day long, engaged in the examination of witnesses upon the subject of Oates's plot: to relieve the tedium of so solemn an inquiry, they issued warrants for the apprehension of considerable number of persons, and among many others, of six Catholic Peers. On the 7th day of this examination, after devoting to the consideration of the legislative measure which they thought grew out of it just as much time as that house was in the habit of giving to a turnpike bill for a new road hastily completed, the Commons sent up this act, which they had framed amid this daily examination of Oates's witnesses, to the House of Lords for their approbation: and that no part of their proceeding should want a share of the spirit which governed their deliberations, with it they sent up warrants for the arrest of six out of the eighteen Catholic Peers who then sat in the House of Lords. The Commons may have deliberated with becoming gravity and temper—they may have framed their bill with sufficient wisdom—they may have an abundant justification for not delaying the course which they thought the emergency required; but in what temper did the Lords proceed, when they saw, unmoved, one third of the Catholic Peers of their own body swept away without inquiry, without trial?—when they saw these Peers, in the very first instance, committed to prison as a necessary preliminary to the first discussion of the question. It was during this calm preparation, furnished by Oates's plot, that the House of Lords was called upon to enact the 30th of Charles the Second, goaded as they were from day to day by the Commons, assailed as they were by all the horrors of the Popish plot, and with this Titus Oates thundering at their doors, they nevertheless tacked the exemption in favour of the Duke of York to the bill so pressed upon them. It, however, went forth sufficiently comprehensive to exclude the whole of the Catholic Peers from their seats in Parliament; not as he had before said, upon any ground of permanent disability, but because they were then supposed to be involved in a particular plot for a specific purpose. This exclusion could not have been intended for any other purpose than to calm the alarm and agitation which then prevailed. If his motion were, however, rejected, what must be the condition of the Catholic Peers? That the measure which their ancestors imposed upon them to effect a precautionary security, if not this night reversed by their vote, must be declared, in the face of the world, by the successors of the men who made it, as permanently fixed upon these peers and their successors for ever, without the shadow of present justification, or the smallest imputation of crime. (hear.) What was the species of right which was affected by both the 25th and 30th of Charles II.? The first interposed against all civil and military possessors of place, the declaration against transubstantiation, in addition to the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; and the 2d enacted that no peer should vote or make his proxy in the house, or sit there during the debates, until he should first take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and make and subscribe the declaration contained in the act; and the consequence of this enactment was the exclusion from the House of Peers of certain Catholic noblemen, not of small number or

insignificant rank, but of great amount and the very highest distinction in the peerage. Against this exclusion a protest was formally entered upon the journals of the House of Lords: it set out with declaring the privilege of the peerage to be an honour which they enjoyed by birthright, and of so inherent a quality as that nothing could do away, but what the law of the land could withal take away, their lives and liberties. It was clear that a great struggle was made to resist this deprivation of privilege, and that the lords yielded to the fears which were then expressed by the Commons. What was however very singular in the proceedings of the House of Lords of that day was, that three years previously, namely, in 1675, the Lords added to a standing order of their house a proviso, which remained up to this hour unrepealed in their journals, and stood as an order by the lords spiritual and temporal in Parliament assembled—that the peerage, being an inherent right, no bill should pass which imposed any test upon Peers preparatory to the delivery of their opinion in the deliberations of their house. How, then, happened it, he would ask, that this standing order, framed and entered three years before the act of 1678, should have been suffered to remain, if the expulsion of the Catholic Peers were intended to be perpetual? He did not mean to set up a standing order of one branch of the legislature in competition with the law of the land, which he knew must be held to be impregnable, or to deny that if the one contained anything incompatible with the provisions of the other, the statute must be obeyed, and the standing order disregarded; but from the circumstance of the latter being suffered to remain, he meant to infer one of two things—either that the lords were at the moment in the possession and exercise of their calm deliberative functions, and intending the expulsion of the peers to be but temporary, did not revoke the standing order; or that, in the hurry and rage of their proceeding, they forebore to pause and look back at the order they had just before adopted, and had acted under the influence of the menaces of the Commons, and under the hazard, if they refused their assent to the measures then demanded, of being involved in the conspiracy to murder the King, and subvert the constitution—that, in fact, their sober and deliberate judgement was overpowered by the sense of the temporary danger in which they were involved at the time. As the House of Commons, too, had not required the suspension of that standing order, it was reasonable to infer that it was suffered to remain to be rendered available for the privileges of those peers when they were to be permitted to resume their temporal rights. This construction derived considerable force from the act itself; it was indeed a sad specimen of that legislative work which many were of opinion ought to be considered as peculiarly unalterable and fundamental. It was a most unhappy example to show the wisdom and sagacity then exercised in framing these acts. The preamble was drawn in so clumsy a manner as to be unworthy of comparison with the style used even in the present day, when legislative acts had become so enormously obscure and cumbrous, as to be framed in the hurry of the moment for almost every purpose. The preamble declared that divers good laws had been made to prevent the increase and dangers of Popery; notwithstanding which, many apprehensions arose from the free access of Popish recusants to his Majesty's person and court, principally by reason of their privilege of late to sit in Parliament; and it then went on to state the necessity of their banishment from the royal presence. The latter part of this preamble was nonsense; for the Catholic lords had not then "of late" had the privilege of sitting in parliament; up to that period they sat in the House of Lords as a matter of right, and were not excluded or affected by the restrictions adopted in the House of Commons. In the latter, some Catholics had contrived by evasions of one kind or another to retain their seats, but there were three expulsions as Popish recusants. The declaration in the preamble could only therefore apply to the Commons; and yet the exclusion which the Bill effected comprehended both, and in its consequences excluded the Lords, not only from their seats in their own house of Parliament, but also from presenting themselves at Court. If this law were to be deemed a bulwark of the constitution, how was it that those who looked upon it as such, should have disregarded the great alteration made in it by his late Majesty in 1791, when he removed the liability of a Catholic Peer to be prosecuted for coming into his Majesty's presence, or into the Court where the King resided? (hear.) It was remarkable that while the act of the 30th of Charles II. excluded all Catholics, peers as well as commoners, from the royal presence, the act of 1791 should restore peers alone, and yet that peers alone should be placed in a most anomalous situation by that very indulgence. The restoration of the Catholic peers to admissibility to the presence of their sovereign, was an admission of their privilege to attend as hereditary counsellors of the crown, notwithstanding the general deprivation of privilege which the act of Charles II. inflicted upon them. But then, what was the state in which Catholic peers were placed by the double operation of the old and new laws affecting them? The act of 1791 altered the oath of supremacy so far as to admit into the King's presence any Catholic peer who had sworn the oath that he did not believe "that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign Prince, Preflate, State or Potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly within this realm;" he had only now to make this disclaimer of the temporal power of the Pope,

and he was competent to tender his advice to his Sovereign in the royal closet. But into Parliament he could not go without denying transubstantiation, and asserting the invocation of the Virgin Mary, and other saints and the sacrifice of the mass, to be superstitions and idolatries. (a laugh.) He did not mean to enter into the spirit of these distinctions between the denial of the temporal power of the Pope and the declaration against transubstantiation; but it did certainly exhibit a strange anomaly in legislation. Here was a Catholic peer, born amongst the possession of other rights, to the enjoyment of two particular privileges—one was to sit in Parliament and to give his advice to his sovereign as a peer, and in the face of his colleagues and of the nation to defend and justify that advice in his place in the legislature; the other privilege was, as an hereditary counsellor of the crown, the right of entering the King's closet and giving his Majesty such advice as he thought wise and expedient for the affairs of the nation. How was this peer placed? If he would only deny the civil and temporal power of the Pope, no man could prevent his entering the royal closet, and advising his Majesty upon his civil and temporal affairs—he might, if he were an assassin, plunge a poniard into his sovereign's breast at such an interview, so easily and simply acquired—he might influence the royal mind without danger or risk, or personal responsibility—the doctrine of transubstantiation must be conceded before he can enter Parliament. (hear, hear). Was there ever an absurdity in the precautionary guards of legislation like this? So that the Catholic Peer could according to this sagacious and fictitious disjunction of the old oaths, go to St. James's and advise his sovereign upon state affairs; but if he turns his horses' heads towards the Parliament House to justify, in his place as a Peer, the advice he had given in the royal closet, he was met by a justice of the peace, and told that into the Parliament he could not enter until he took the spiritual oaths—that the taking of these was a necessary preliminary to the privilege of defending the counsel he had given, (loud cries of hear, and laughter). Was it in this spirit they were to continue to legislate in the 19th century upon the example and authority of a House of Lords sitting and legislating under *duress* in the 17th century? And were they to continue to act upon a declaration of danger expressed in the preamble, but repealed in the better spirit of more modern times? From the *duress* in which the House of Lords in Charles the Second's time debated, and the avowed danger in the preamble of their act, he drew this conclusion—either the act of Charles the Second ought to be maintained, or the partial repeal of it by the act of 1791 abandoned. If the one were necessary, the other could not; and the sooner it was with its sister provision withdrawn, the better. Amongst all the anomalies with which their legislation had been charged, this respecting the Catholic Peers was the greatest; but the anomaly did not cease where he had just left it, and, as the late reign of George the 3d, fertile in relief as it had been, had added another anomaly in endeavouring to ameliorate the condition of those who revered the late King's memory for his beneficence towards them, so it remained at the very opening of his present Majesty's auspicious reign, for King George the 4th to add some little further anomaly to the condition of his Catholic Peers, which, like all the preceding attempts to mitigate their condition, had aggravated the fate of those whom it was intended to dignify. Last year, for the first time during a century, were Catholic Peers summoned to attend the ceremony of a royal coronation—an august ceremony which he should degrade were he to consider as an ostentatious parade, or mere gorgeous pageant, instead of being, as it was, the solemn renewal on the part of the king of a free people of the understood compact which bound them together; and when his Majesty appeared in person amongst them to receive the homage of his nobles, his officers—of, in fact, all the orders of the realm. This solemn and magnificent ceremony, be it recollect, took place in the presence of the representatives of the Potentates of Catholic as well as Protestant Europe, with all that awful and imposing Majesty, which was arranged to accompany the appearance of the King on such an occasion, when surrounded by a great and free people, and which no doubt the ambassadors were to report to the King's allies throughout the world. Who, on that great occasion, overtopped the whole peerage of Great Britain?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who was it that the King selected to return thanks to the peers of the realm and his other loving subjects, when they had risen to pay the homage of pleading his Majesty's health?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. Who did homage on that memorable day as premier peer, in the presence of the assembled peerage of the kingdom?—the Catholic Duke of Norfolk. (hear.) Do you imagine (continued Mr. Canning) that it never occurred to the representatives of the Potentates of Europe, then contemplating this imposing spectacle?—Do you imagine that not only the ministers of Catholic Austria, Catholic France, but of States more bigotted (if there be any bigotted) to the Catholic religion, to reflect that the moment this solemn ceremony was over, the Duke of Norfolk became disengaged of the exercise of his privileges among his fellow-peers, stripped of his robes of office, and of his peerage, which were to be worn by the other peers, of whatever degree, but by him were to be laid aside and hung up until the distant—be it a very distant day, when the coronation of a successor to his present most gracious Sovereign should again call

him forth to assist in the solemnization. (cheers.) Thus, before the eyes of the peers and people of England, in the presence of the representatives of the illustrious princes of the nations of the world, the Duke of Norfolk standing highest in rank among the peers, the Lord Clifford, like him, representing a long line of illustrious and heroic ancestry, were to appear merely called forth and furnished for the pageant, like the wax candles and lustres that flamed and sparkled in the scene; and then, when they had graced the solemnity of the day, to be, like them, thrown by as useless and temporary formalities. (cheers.) They were alone, among all those who had the privilege of paying their homage to the King, shut out from assisting the councils of their nation, and testifying by their votes their loyalty and duty to his Majesty and his people. (hear.) Was it not, he would ask, trifling with their feelings, to tell them that they were unworthy of their individual share in the legislation of that country, in whose most august ceremony they were yet deemed worthy to take so pre-eminent a part, and were acknowledged to have performed it with so much distinguished dignity? (hear.) It would be better policy to have left them under all their disabilities unnoticed in that day of state, than to bring them forward in the front of the ceremony and splendour of such an occasion, and expose them in the eyes of the world to the humiliation of being supposed to labour under that natural disqualification in addition to their civil exclusion—of being satisfied with the trumpery distinction (for such in comparison it was) of being intrusted with a place in that pageant, while they were deemed unworthy of enjoying the more substantial privileges of their birth and rank. (loud cries of hear.) Compare the situation in which the Catholic peers were placed at the coronation, with that of any of the other illustrious personages assembled on the occasion. All others appeared adding the formal display of their rank to the enjoyment of its more substantial attributes, while they alone were invited to a momentary possession of distinction in the state, which almost in the same instant they were called upon to abandon; and every repetition of which must convey to ingenuous minds, not the exaltation of rank, but its additional degradation. (hear, hear.) In vain may they trace back the glories of their ancestry—in vain may they appeal to the long experience of their own loyalty and their worth, their privilege was still to hoist the banner in the recurring day of chivalrous pomp, but to lay it down when that day had passed, and to forego all, the real and substantial advantages of their illustrious rank and condition in the community in which they lived, until they could obey the call of their legislative opponents, and cease to utter aspiritual and ecclesiastical homilies according to the practice of their ancestors. (cheers.) Having stated thus much as applicable to the case of the English Catholic peers, he should now for a moment turn to the condition of the Catholic peers in his sister kingdom. In the course of the late royal visit of his Majesty to Ireland—a visit which he agreed with his right hon. friend (Mr. Plunkett) in thinking was as much a measure of wisdom as of grace—a noble lord of the Catholic religion (the Earl of Fingall) was, by the grace and favour of his Majesty, decorated with the ribbon of the national order of Ireland (the order of St. Patrick). He (Mr. Canning) was curious to learn if there were any circumstances connected with this mark of distinction, which made it come with peculiar grace and favour from the King to the Earl of Fingall. He had therefore directed his attention to the Statutes of the order, and in the preamble read the qualifications which the personage was supposed to possess who was selected for the distinguished honour of being a knight of St. Patrick. It set out with declaring “that whereas it hath been the custom of the wisest and most beneficent princes to distinguish their loyal and dutiful subjects by marks of honour, and thereby to point out their eminent merits and services, as an example to excite the emulation of others to attain similar distinction.” These were the reasons which recommended and justified the selection of Lord Fingall for so high a mark of his Majesty’s favour. But as the emulation which that most gracious act was to excite, how was that to be exemplified? Did not the law of the land place Lord Fingall, when he departed from the court of Dublin to his own estate in the country in a worse situation as to the real exercise of political power than any of the labourers who tilled the ground around his dwelling? Lord Fingall, because of being a Catholic peer, was not only wholly disqualified from sitting or voting in either house of Parliament, but also from voting at the election of a member for either, (hear, hear, hear.) The tillers of his ground, Catholic or Protestant could, perhaps, the very humblest among them, vote at the election of a member to represent him in Parliament, while Lord Fingall alone was not thought fit to be intrusted with the privilege of voting at the election of any of the representative peers of Ireland. (hear, hear.) Was that an anomaly which ought to have perpetual existence? Here he begged to say, that if the house allowed him to bring in the bill which he meant to propose to their consideration, he meant to include the Irish as well as the English Peers, and that the former should have the privilege of being candidates for the representative peerage, as well as voting at the elections for their own body. (hear, hear.) He had as yet considered the act of 1678 only in a political point of view; but he should greatly un-

derrate its importance, if he were not to say that its operation upon the individuals who suffered by it was peculiarly distressing and impolitic. One could not possibly look at the period and circumstances of the passing of that act, without seeing that the House of Lords was under duress at the time, and had been instigated to pass the measure by false pretences. (hear, hear.) When he spoke of false pretences, he begged to repeat his former observation, that were the motives real instead of being false—were the objects to extinguish the Catholic peerage, instead of to exclude the Duke of York, (a right and necessary measure at the time)—if it had been just at the time, instead of being doubtful and suspicious, still he would say, that the necessity for continuing the infliction of these restrictions had long since passed away. Were the five Catholic peers who were not tried proved guilty, instead of no charge being attempted to be substantiated against them—were Lord Stafford as guilty as he was believed to be innocent—he should have still to say that no political grounds had been made out, to visit upon the Catholic peerage perpetual disabilities—(hear, hear)—he should have still to say that the pretenses upon which the operation of these laws was attempted to be sustained, could not be admitted in reason or in justice—that their whole spirit and tenor was inconsistent with the principle of British law—that it was revolting to humanity, if even the pretenses were true, to brand remote posterity with eternal penalties for their acts of times long ceasing to influence the present age. But when all these pretenses were false—when the origin of these acts, the Popish plot, was built upon the fabrication of abandoned wretches committing the most enormous perjury, then he would ask upon what grounds were these exclusions to be justified, with what grace could any man call for their prolongation? He (Mr. Canning) contended, that to these Catholic peers, not only in reference to their quality as peers of the land, but to their feelings and their characters as men, the country owed an atonement, for the blood which had been shed, for the wounds which had been inflicted, for the punishments with which they had been visited. The country owed them a relief from those restraints which it had decreed in its severity; and which, even if they were merited by the original transgressors, had been too severely imposed upon their offending posterity. In common fairness and candour, he thought the house must believe, that Parliament had formerly taken the Popish confessions, on which they proceeded, not in any deep and entire conviction of their truth, but in that sort of unexamining belief, which made them think that those confessions contained enough to effect the accomplishment of their object; and that although they imagined it might be sufficient to carry such a parliamentary object, they did not suppose it would go any farther. Now, if he found that the act alluded to was passed by the same impulse, as it were, which brought Lord Stafford to the block; that, surely, furnished a ground of suspicion as to its real object, which Parliament would do well now to remove. Here again, he might be permitted to say, that he was far from feeling any desire to enter upon this litigated question. He proposed only to propound the facts, and they were these—that the accusation against Lord Stafford and his confederacy, was got up hastily, as a harbinger to the subsequent bill; and, without doubt, as a propable means of effecting his ruin, that those means, eventually, so far succeeded as that not only the venerable person designated in the bill, but the whole of the Catholic Peers of the realm were excluded from Parliament—that in pursuance of this accusation, the Earl of Stafford was brought to trial, condemned, and beheaded—that in about 6 or 7 years after that event, the principal witnesses against him were convicted of perjury (hear); and after that conviction, a bill reversing Lord Stafford’s attainder was brought into the House of Lords, and passed there; but that on its coming down to the House of Commons, it was rejected. This rejection was accounted for by some historians, on the ground of the house’s disinclination to entertain a bill of this nature: while others accounted for it, and as he (Mr. Canning) thought sufficiently, by the intervention of the questions which naturally occupied their attention upon the occasion of the Duke of Monmouth’s landing; besides which, that parliament soon ceased to sit. True it was, that after that parliament had been dissolved, the bill was not reversed; true it was, that Titus Oates, who had been convicted of perjury, and although he could not sustain his accusations, was, after the revolution, pensioned by Government; yet he (Mr. Canning) was very much afraid that all this was no recognition of the principle of that bill, that like many other unjust measures, it had been enacted, not so much from any feeling of its justice or its policy, as on account of the

“Res dura, et regni novitas—”

of the temper and condition of the times. He was fearful that it had not been much considered or looked into; and he was the rather confirmed in this opinion, when he found a sensible and judicious historian like Mr. Hume capable of publishing this remark on the bill for attainting Lord Stafford:—“The bill fixed so deep a reprobation on the former proceedings of the exclusionists, that it met with great opposition among the Lords; and it was at last, after one reading, dropped by the Commons. Though the reparation of injustice be the second honour which a nation can attain, the present emergence seemed very improper

for granting so full a justification to the Catholics, and throwing so foul a stain on the Protestants." The statement of the historian, then, was, that some justification was to be found for Parliament, not so much on the merits of the case, as on the expediency of separating those merits, which already weighed so strongly on the minds of the members, from it. He (Mr. Canning) would not say whether or no Mr. Hume was right in this statement, but he himself drew from it the same inference which he had already drawn from the acts of Charles the Second's reign. Had Parliament now any similar reasons for excluding the Catholic peers? (hear, hear.) Could it experience any difficulty in making, as far as lay in its power, atonement to their descendants? Were the same jealousies now to be consulted? Was there any reason why the judgment of the house should now be influenced to adopt measures tending to destroy the uniformity and equity of that constitution to which we owed our immortal form of government, and our otherwise equal laws? (hear, hear.) Or, would they now be disposed to defend every act of a Government whose proceedings were to be excused on the score of expediency? But, though the reversal of that act of attainder did not pass, and though Oates was pensioned as having been a martyr (and if he was not a martyr, he was a victim; for it must be admitted, notwithstanding that he did not adequately atone for his wickedness, he did suffer to such a degree as earned for him among all descriptions of men, feelings of commiseration for the severity of his punishment); the historian appeared to feel that it had been better if that pension had not been conferred. From the extract which he (Mr. Canning) had read, the house would have perceived that Mr. Hume, without giving any opinion as to the injustice of withholding the reversal of the attainder, had rather defended it on principles of expediency. Yet this was the cold observation of the same writer, who, with regard to the execution of Lord Stafford, had spoken thus:—"This is the last blood which was shed on account of the Popish plot; an incident, which for the credit of the nation, it were better to bury in eternal oblivion; but which it is necessary to perpetuate, as well to maintain the truth of history, as to warn, if possible, their posterity and all mankind, never again to fall into so shameful and barbarous a delusion." Stanhope had this remark upon the failure of the measure:—"The Lords, in passing the bill, did it rather to oblige the King, than with any view to do justice to Lord Stafford. But the Commons did not entertain the same deference for the wishes of James; it was lost in that house, after a second reading, and was never heard of more." Yet, in spite of the truth of these relations—*as* spite of the representations of the historians he had named, and of the perjuries of Oates—what were the opinions of more impartial judges on the subject of Lord Stafford's attainder, as they had been delivered at a later period of our history? In the year 1786, on the question which was about that time raised as to the abatement of Mr. Warren Hastings's impeachment, considerable debates took place both in the House of Commons and House of Lords. In the discussion of precedents on that occasion the case of Lord Stafford, as to the continuation or discontinuation of an impeachment after the dissolution of a parliament, was very much relied on. It was his (Mr. Canning's) intention to quote the opinions of two very distinguished men, and he was sure that their names alone would command attention—they were the late Lords Thurlow and Kenyon. Lord Thurlow, undoubtedly, was not a favourer of Catholic emancipation; and Lord Kenyon, he believed, was as little affected towards it; at any rate, it would be allowed, that the latter had not squeamishness to his posterity any vehement affection for it. Lord Thurlow declared "that he disdained a precedent which was derived from times when accusations, darkly contrived, and impudently alleged against innocent men, were greedily entertained—when individuals were liable to suffer in their lives and fortunes, not because they had committed crimes against the state, but because they had rendered themselves obnoxious to this or that party in the state." Lord Kenyon's opinion was still more marked and decided; he also rejected the precedent; "and he said that whatever, while their passions were excited, and their feelings were strong, men might have the thought, at the time, of the conviction and sentence of Lord Stafford, he firmly believed that there was no one of them who, when reason had resumed her seat, and sober reflection had dissipated the mists of prejudice, would not have thought with him (Lord Kenyon) that the execution of the Earl of Stafford was a legal murder." (hear.) On this part of the subject, therefore, it might be enough for him (Mr. Canning) to observe, that he placed the opinion of the late Lord Kenyon against the evidence of Titus Oates. (laugh) But it was not alone on these concurrent testimonies, important as they were, that he relied. He must implicitly believe in the dying protestations of Lord Stafford. He did believe in the innocence of those other peers, who like Lord Stafford, were accused; but who were not, as he was, put upon their trial. It was impossible not to feel, that the succession of corrupted witnesses, the fate of Stafford, and the expulsion of the Catholic peers from Parliament, were all of them parts of the same system. The chain of facts was unbroken; and the reasonings upon them were irrefragable. Those who had called upon the Parliament to exclude the Catholic peers, and who founded that appeal on the ground of the Popish

plot, staked the truth of their charges upon the fate of Lord Stafford's bill. Now he (Mr. Canning) contended, that the truth and equity of the bill (the 30th Charles II.) which he wished the house to modify, came as completely to issue upon the fate of Lord Stafford himself. The innocence of that nobleman, he trusted, he had already clearly demonstrated. It was, then, upon these two grounds, that he thought the Parliament of this day ought to revoke the measure to which his motion referred. They ought to do so first, because, constitutionally speaking, they had violated an inherent principle—a principle which, according to the feelings of all those who possessed it, as well as in the respective judgments of those who had consented to its abrogation, was of so inherent a nature, so completely a birthright, that it ought never to be attacked, excepting upon occasions that attacked property and life itself. Secondly, the act in question ought to be altered; because this punishment which, if carried with it, if it was just with regard to the circumstances under which it was inflicted, would continue to be just, while those circumstances should continue, or others of a similar character, should arise in their place. But it was unjust, because it had visited for more than stonement; it had visited not the crime, but the innocent posterity of those who were said to have been criminal. It was another urgent reason why this bill should be repealed—that it was founded upon evidence, the truth of which Parliament had had the best means of trying by the rules of legal evidence: and, in the judgment of every impartial man upon the question of their guilt or innocence, against whom that bill was enacted, their innocence was substantiated. He (Mr. Canning) was not to be deterred in considering the consequences of which such a measure as this projected alteration might be productive, by being told of the anomaly which it would introduce into the constitution. When gentlemen said, that they found Roman Catholics excluded from Parliament, and that therefore so they ought to continue; he would beg leave to remind them, that the anomaly of which they complained had existed for more than a century, without affecting the prosperity of the state, or encroaching upon its liberties. He must remind them, that rights which remained on one side, and rights which were enjoyed upon the other, were not one and the same thing; he must tell them that eligibility and possession were not the same thing; for the one was to be argued upon grounds of expediency, the other on that of justice. No man could think more sincerely than he did; that they did wrong in refusing to Roman Catholic seats in that house; but that was a different wrong from the one of which he complained. It was, indeed, the withholding of an important right; but the right had always been clogged with difficulties and impediments. Hardly at any time had it been entirely admitted, or tranquilly enjoyed, since the Reformation. But the wrong to which the Catholic peer had been subjected was of a totally different kind. It was the deprivation of a right, which was as much his as his property and life. He (Mr. Canning) trusted he had shown this on the fullest evidence. He was as much unwilling as any man could be, to make inviolate references, while he wished to see the Catholic peers restored to their own house, where they had so clear a right to sit. Those noblemen, it was hardly needful that he should say, placed in the exalted situations which they occupied, did not wish to see their fellow Catholics of inferior rank deprived of their privileges, and subject also to exclusion from the parliament. But he must contend that as on the one hand, the right taken away was not the same, so, on the other, had the induction of punishment been beyond all proportion. A number of contingencies might operate to prevent the entrance of the untitled Catholic into parliament, supposing his other disabilities were removed, which he would be liable to, however, in common with every candidate whatever. He might be an officer of the revenue—he might not have the requisite pecuniary qualification; or he might not, like hundreds of others who had gone before him, have the good fortune to be chosen. But he did not, like the Catholic peer, bear about him the distinctive mark of his exclusion—the badge of deprivations. (hear.) No man ever met the present Duke of Norfolk, for instance, in company, without knowing that that nobleman was shut out from the councils of his sovereign. (hear.) None ever saw the coronet which sparkled on his brow, without a feeling that it branded rather than distinguished its illustrious possessor; no man could hear his wide possessions, his proud titles enumerated, without being sensible that their owner was degraded by such an exclusion. The proceeding itself which had produced this injustice might be so stated. Parliament had taken from these peers a right, and inflicted on them a grievous wrong. The right honourable gentleman then proceeded to show, that the hardship of exclusion bore most disproportionately upon the Peers professing the Roman Catholic religion. The uncontradicted principle of his (Mr. Canning's) present motion, was the exclusion of several of them from their seats in the House of Lords. The exclusion of Roman Catholics from Parliament was a question which rested on solid, but on different merits; the peculiarity of the peers' case consisted in their situation, by no means the same as that of others of the same religion—in the nature of that right which they had lost—in the injustice through which they had lost it—and in the inflictions which the statute of exclusion had occasioned them. And so far from

PARLIAMENTARY.

—201—

paying an excessive homage to rank or property, or station, in selecting these illustrious victims as the objects of redress, he (Mr. Canning) did them hard justice. They had stood by for nearly 50 years, while to other Roman Catholics great relaxations of disabling law, and many privileges, had been conceded. They had stood by silent and contented spectators of the benefits conferred on others (cheering); and if he now presented himself to carry their appeal before Parliament, he would only say (without feeling it necessary to refer more particularly to these distinguished persons), that, though perhaps it was not against their will, it was certainly without their concurrence. (cheering.) The honourable member for Somersetshire (to whom he was much obliged for the attention with which he had that evening honoured him) would, he was sure, acknowledge that he (Mr. Canning) had now shown that his present proposition would not impair the argument as to the general question. That was as much a case by itself, and stood upon as peculiar grounds, as any case in Westminster-hall, which had no relation to the one that was to follow. It was to be argued on its own merits; it possessed a separate principle. Certain he (Mr. Canning) felt, that whatever the honourable baronet (Sir T. Lethbridge, we believe) might think as to that general question, he would not withhold his consent to relieve the Catholic peers from those inflictions to which they had so long been subjected; inflictions—punishments—of which they had not, assuredly, been deserving, but which were at present injurious to these individuals. So confident did he feel in the view which he had taken of the injustice of the act of Charles, that if it were possible to bring the case before any tribunal of the country which should have the power of revising the proceedings of the legislature, he was certain that the Catholic peers would carry their claim before it. Taking all the circumstances of the Popish plot into consideration, their contemporaneous effect upon that house of the legislature which passed the measure in question, a bill enacted so reluctantly and all the features of which that very house declared, by a protest still extant on their journals, to be hostile to the constitution; and considering the innocence of those against whom its provisions were levelled, particularly of Lord Stafford, he felt justified in saying that there was no jury which, upon such a case, would not hold that the Catholic peers were entitled to the restoration of their place in Parliament. Now what would be the effect of a resolution of this kind? It was hardly necessary to consider the effect of carrying the wider question. He would not say, indeed, that the success of the present proposition might not induce a desire of seeing the Catholics generally eligible to parliament. But how different was that question, and supposing them eligible, how few would be returned? (hear, hear.) So firmly was the degradation attached to them by the long disabilities of many years, that very few would find their way into that house, even when admissible to it. Any thing which removed from any part of that body a portion of this degradation, was, "pro tanto," a relief from oppression; and on this account the admission of the Catholic peers would efface some part of their wrongs. What! was not the whole clergy of England ennobled by having its prelates in the House of Lords, although there was an express statute prohibiting any mere parson from sitting in the Commons House of Parliament, and a rule of common law to the same effect? Was it possible that body in the state should not partake of the dignity or degradation attaching to those who were at its head? Did not the meanest Catholic in the kingdom sympathise with the Duke of Norfolk for the sufferings endured by him on account of his exclusion from rights to which the meanest Catholic might not even indulge the desire of attaining? No better illustration could be applied to this part of the question, than one drawn from a plan which was matured by the genius of a right hon. friend of his (Mr. Peel.) A scheme was suggested for paying off, at stated periods, large masses of notes by bars of gold. Then it was said that the poor man's paper note would be depreciated in value, while the rich man could carry hundreds of his notes to the Bank, and get them exchanged for bullion. The government, however, wisely adopted the scheme, and an enactment followed to make it permanent; but it had never been acted upon. The consequence was, the value of the currency was speedily raised from one end of the country to the other; and the note of the poor man was speedily replaced by gold coin to its amount, although he could have nothing to do with the purchase of the bars of gold. So, if Parliament should determine to admit the Catholic peers to their seats, although the Catholic peasantry could be little affected, so far as regarded any prospect of their reaching parliamentary honours, yet they would find the benefit of such a measure, because the character of the Roman Catholic body would be immediately raised throughout the kingdom. He trusted that he had thus far fulfilled his promise of not diverging into the general question of Catholic disabilities; and if he should now be met with any assertions that this was opening the whole question, and then with the argument upon it, he should consider his cause as gained. (cheering.) He desired to know, first of all, whether the House of Commons had been informed on what principle the Catholic peers were excluded from the House of Lords under the 30th Charles II., after they had been expressly cited and returned there by Elizabeth at the time when she imposed the oath of supremacy on the House of Commons. He

did not think it by any means clear that Elizabeth imposed that oath even on the House of Commons with any decided intention of excluding Roman Catholics from Parliament. The oaths administered to Catholics were of two sorts; some putting them *bona fide* upon the test of their allegiance, while others had been framed (their allegiance being decided in the minds of the framers), not as the test of loyalty, but of Catholicism. He was confident that this was true, just as much as he was that the enactments of the 30th of Chas. II. were devised, not as a test of allegiance, but with a foreknowledge in the mind of their framers that they should find some oath which the Catholics would not take. He thought that the 30th of Charles II. was in no part of it re-enacting bill; for though it imposed the oath of allegiance, it re-imposed it *alias intuitu*. The 30th of Charles II., to the disqualifications which it imposed upon the Catholics, added the old ones of Elizabeth: why were they added, but for one of two reasons—either with the view of excluding the Duke of York from the throne, as he was then a Catholic, or else in consequence of the exposition of the Popish plot? If it was in consequence of the Popish plot, he (Mr. Canning) desired to know, not whether this or that gentleman thought it a true narrative, but whether the House of Commons thought that the Catholic Peers were justly or unjustly impeached. (hear, hear.) If unjustly, why was the bill framed to exclude them from Parliament? If justly why were they not put upon their trial? (hear, hear.) If he were told that one of them was brought to trial, he desired to ask whether his innocence was not clearly established? And if it was not, he wished to ascertain, whether all the posterity of those Catholic Peers were to be included in an eternal proscription? Even in this case, it would be, not because the Earl of Stafford had been desirous of overthrowing the State, but because he had been unjustly accused of such an intention, and decapitated. He asked whether, in the present day, any reasonable fears could be entertained of the Pope himself, of the attempts of Popish insidiously, or the fabrication of Popish plots (*a laugh*); for these had been the grounds of a statute of disabilities which were at once the memorial and the only justification of their origin. (hear, hear.) In rendering this homage to justice, there was no danger of establishing any improper precedent which should hereafter guide the experience of Parliament. Undoubtedly the whole question of Catholic disability or admissibility could rest only on grounds of political expediency, operating upon those common and natural rights which it was obligatory upon every body to respect. He claimed for the Catholic Peers as a matter of right, and nothing else. As a question of right, it could not stand upon grounds which should render it necessary for him to open the general question. He would appeal to that house, and to all the sets which it had passed in favour of the constitutional rights of the people—he appealed not from the former to the present times, but from ancestor to ancestor, from Shaftesbury to Barnet, from Oates to Elizabeth—he appealed to them and to experience, for the evidence of the justice and policy upon which the claim of the Catholic Peers was founded. He called upon them not to adopt the opinions of Hume, nor to defend a wrong measure, rather than concede a point to be injured. (cheers.) He could assure the House, that he would not have brought this question forward, had he not felt the necessity of doing justice as far as he could to the case of the Catholic Peers? and he now called upon them to restore those rights by a determination which should be in the eye of humanity charitable, and in the name of God just. The right honourable gentleman concluded amidst loud cheering from both sides of the house, by moving for leave to bring in a bill to repeal so much of an act of the 30th of Charles II. as debars Roman Catholic peers from the exercise of their right to sit and vote in the house of Lords.

A gentleman, whose name we understood to be Agar Ellis, seconded the motion.

Mr. Secretary PEEL then rose, and commenced his address by remarking, that if his right honourable friend (Mr. Canning) knew the full extent of the admiration which he (Mr. Peel) entertained of his abilities—if he knew the delight and gratification that never failed to attend those who were present at the exhibition of them, he might perhaps think him (Mr. Peel) a little presumptuous in offering at so early a period some answer to a speech thus eloquent and impressive. But on an arena like that, it was important that every reason actually existing, and producing an operative effect, should be explained; whether it tended to the one side or the other, among all those who were found not to arrive at the same conclusion. With this persuasion, he intended to follow his right honourable friend, *haut passibus equis* it was true, from the point at which he set out, through the line of argument he had adopted. The fancy of the house had been engaged, by the brilliant metaphors employed in the speech of his right honourable friend; their passions had also been inflamed by appeals that could affect their passions only; and it was impossible for him, however necessary, to contend against all this fervour, to rest on aught but sober reasoning. He was perfectly willing to avoid, in his argument, all discussion of the general principle, and did not hesitate (though he who gave the challenge, should leave perhaps to his opponent the choice of armour) to enter the field within the limits prescribed by his right honourable friend. In commencement, then,

he would say that he could perceive no sound reason for exempting Roman Catholic Peers from political restrictions to which a whole community professing the same religious tenets were by law subject. (hear, hear.) He should not, he hoped, be regarded as one forgetful of the respect due to high moral character, or insensible to the dignity which attached to hereditary rank and station, in the course which he now felt it his duty to pursue. (hear.) The house might be assured that he acknowledged not that "rigid philosophy" which in the language of Dr. Johnson overlooked these distinctions, nor should he be diverted either by that or any other cause from examining closely and respectfully at the same time, the propositions of his right honourable friend. This design he hoped to adhere to without artifice or exception and not at all availing him of ancient criticism, which in one of its maxims would recommend a more cautious proceeding—

—et quæ
Desperat tractata nitescere posse, relinquit—

He should avoid all extraneous allusion, nor deviate in the least, if he could possibly guard himself against it. (hear.) The first objection then, and it had not escaped his right honourable friend's notice, was, that by adopting the resolution the house would be dealing with a question that exclusively regarded the other House of Parliament. (hear, hear.) It was acknowledged that a question of this kind evidently referred to policy that must in a great measure be decided upon precedent. Now he (Mr. Peel) doubted strongly, whether any of the precedents quoted on this occasion furnished an adequate authority for the view taken by his right honourable friend. The first, if not sole example of that house disabling certain peers, or at all legislating on the qualifications of persons to sit in the other house of Parliament, was in 1640, and it was incumbent on them to recollect the circumstances of the time, and the peculiar feelings which then prevailed. (hear, hear.) Then, indeed, certain members of the other house were affected by a vote of the Commons; but it was not an example which it was probable they would be anxious to imitate. (hear.) It was not till the 30th Charles II. that the legislature naturally enough wished to repeal the former act (hear,) and imposed a necessity for a declaration against transubstantiation, which indicated that the peers were alone subject to the oath of supremacy. His right honourable friend had argued, that in practice and effect, Roman Catholic peers were not excluded from seats in Parliament till the year 1778. Certainly they were not, except by the oath of supremacy, whilst others were restrained by different obligations. It should not, however, be forgotten, that this did comprehend a question which had given rise to opinions directly adverse. Authorities of a very contradictory nature might be produced; how far, and in what way, did his right honourable friend propose to use them? He was ready to wait till those on the other side, however antiquated or musty, should be advanced, and should reserve till future opportunity the introduction of their adversaries. Then might come an immediate decision, as to the differences of footing upon which peers and commoners stood before the reign of Charles II. But the house at this moment could not fail to bear in mind, that the whole subject had been recently discussed, and that it had reached a kind of settlement which it was hoped might cause much of previous agitation to subside, and might bring the subjects of one King and Government to that community of feeling which was so desirable in every period. His right honourable friend, the Member for the University of Dublin, (Mr. Plunkett), had in his late most impressive speech viewed the question in this light. It was not till the case of Sir Solomon Swale, who had been previously convicted of recusancy, that the act of the 30th Charles II. was passed—120 years after the original act of Elizabeth. His right honourable friend omitted all mention of these circumstances, however connected with his argument in support of the doctrine—that the prevailing policy of those times was often sacrificed and yielded to notions of civil right. The argument of Sir R. Sawyer as stated in our law books, was entirely opposed to the inference which it bad that might be endeavoured to establish. His right honourable friend (Mr. Plunkett) was indeed mistaken in the use that he had made of this portion of our history. What was the title of the act which passed in 1678? It was "the better to secure the King's Government, by disabling Roman Catholics to sit in Parliament, &c." Here was no manifestation of any difference in the views entertained by our ancestors as regarded different classes of Roman Catholics. But his right honourable friend (Mr. Canning), who made this motion, seemed to think that it rested on a ground peculiar to itself. His opinion appeared to be, that there was an inherent privilege in the peerage, not to be tampered with under any but the most extraordinary circumstances, or dangers of the most imminent nature. To this opinion he (Mr. Peel) objected on constitutional principles. (hear, hear.) He begged leave to deny that peers were exempted from any of the restrictions or disabilities that were still applicable to commoners. Let them look, if they pleased, to the Irish union? and what, he asked, would they discover there that controverted his proposition. It exhibited, indeed, some anomaly; but the inference from it was directly the other way. Peers remained liable to the same punishments and penalties as commoners; but they were to

sit in Parliament (he of course alluded to Irish Protestant peers) by the title of election. But as this was not altogether a novel regulation, as a similar principle had been adopted in the union with Scotland, was it not a little surprising that his right honourable friend should have abstained from all mention of, or allusion to, this last event? (hear, hear.) His right honourable friend had at least forbore from reminding the house of one part of that celebrated treaty, and it was left to him (Mr. Peel) to submit to Parliament whether they would now qualify Catholic Peers to sit among them, or respect, *en nomine*, that article of the Act of Union, in which it was specifically declared that no person being a Papist should vote for, or sit as any Member of the estates of that realm? (hear, hear.) Could it be denied that this article now formed as valid a barrier against the contemplated innovation, as any statute or national contract on record? It went to shew that no such doctrine as that of any inherent privilege existing in the peers was recognized by Lord Somers, or the other great Whig ministers of that day. If they had acknowledged the principle, would they ever have admitted or sanctioned a provision that must so effectually subvert it? (hear, hear.) No: had they held the opinion of his right honourable friend, they would never have thus attempted to bind future Parliaments to a fixed and determinate policy. But it had been maintained, that the Commons never interfered with the privileges of Peers, except in cases that would affect their lives. This was evidently not correct: the contrary had been already indicated. With regard to the Roman Catholic Peers of England, they were in number as had been stated, not more than six or seven. Now did his right honourable friend's measure provide only for the introduction of these peers to seats in the other house? No; it invested the Crown with the power of an unlimited increase. (hear, hear.) Whilst one branch of the legislature was subject to a variety of changes, the other was to be free from every alteration, but that which emanated from the Crown. Whilst the House of Commons, sitting as representatives of the people, with limited functions and a temporary existence, submitted to certain tests, upon what ground reconcileable to the constitution were members of the other house to be exempted? He desired also to inquire, where was the necessity for recognizing this supposed right in the peerage, admitting it to exist? (hear, hear.) It did not appear to him to be either necessary or expedient. His right honourable friend had urged that it would have the effect of generally elevating the Roman Catholics. Why, let the house now consider the situation in which it actually stood with regard to this question. Only seven or eight months had elapsed since they passed a bill containing a declaration that affected the whole Catholic community. Where was the imperious necessity that dictated to them this form of entering upon the subject? It was, as far as he knew, the first instance of the question being thus divided. From the year 1803, when, for the first time after the Union, it was brought before the house by Mr. Fox, seconded by Mr. Grattan, no proposition had been submitted to the legislature affecting peers exclusively. Neither could he perceive in the present circumstances any peculiar reason for taking up the subject in this mode. What, in fact, were those circumstances? Among the chief, it could not fail to be recollected by the house, that his right honourable friend, the member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunkett) had given notice that he intended to bring forward the whole question at an early period of the next session. (hear.) Why then now, when approaching to the end of the present session, should they wish to confer on Roman Catholic peers the barren privilege of being entitled to sit in Parliament during an interval when no Parliament was held? (hear.) At the commencement of the ensuing session the subject would, they had ground to expect, be opened by his right hon. friend in all its bearings. He confessed that, notwithstanding the eloquent and ingenious speech of his right hon. friend (Mr. Canning), he was not satisfied that any clear or substantial case had been stated in support of the present motion. Still he remembered that he had given a pledge at the commencement of his observations, which he hoped not to abandon: it was that of accurately examining that course of legal and constitutional history which formed the basis of his right hon. friend's whole argument. Might he not then fairly say, that his right hon. friend had endeavoured to trace the exclusion and final disabilities of the Catholics to the Popish plot, and to the discoveries of Oates?—that previous to the year 1678 they were not so disqualified? Now he (Mr. Peel) must here protest against the selection of detached periods of history on which to raise an argument of this kind. It was not from isolated events, or the peculiar circumstances attending one occasion, that they could deduce a just or fair conclusion upon a question so extensive. Times of commotion required them to carry back their views into antecedent circumstances, before they came to a final judgment. Neither the French revolution, nor any epoch resembling it, would ever be regarded in its true light, unless the predisposing causes were understood as well as the concurrence of fortuitous events that happened contemporaneously. On various considerations, the policy and principles to which he had been adverted were re-enacted and confirmed at the period of the revolution. The Bill of Rights was itself an example of the firm and enduring nature of this policy. Whatever his

right hon. friends might think of Oates or of the Popish plot, it was, in his (Mr. Peel's) opinion, manifest that there did then exist a formidable and infamous conspiracy against the Protestant establishment. (hear.) The object of the conspirators was not merely to extinguish and destroy the Protestant religion. Immediately after the downfall of Clarendon, a disposition was evinced by the Court, as well as by particular individuals, for rooting out the Protestant faith, and subverting the constitution in church and state. It was due, in common justice to our ancestors, to the memory of those who established the rights which we were now enjoying, to refer, to the situation, in which they were placed, and the motives that influenced their conduct. If he admitted all the monstrous injustice which was said to have been committed in the case of Lord Stafford, did it follow that no foundation existed for the policy that was adopted by our forefathers in 1678, and that was afterwards sanctioned and continued? (hear, hear.) He did not agree with Mr. Dryden, who had said

“Succeeding times will equal madness call,
“Believing nothing, or believing all.”

And if he granted that in what was called the Popish plot might be found an extravagant fabrication and tissue of wickedness, still he must ask what was the prevailing temper at that time, and how were these disclosures received? (hear, hear.) People at that time were in possession of their common sense; it was the period when, according to Blackstone, our constitution had become theoretically perfect. Mr. Fox had described it as the era of good laws and of bad government. Would these stories against the Catholics have been listened to with such avidity, had not a feeling existed that there was ground for jealousy and suspicion? King Charles the Second had, throughout his reign, by every sort of artifice, and apparently out of favour to the Dissenters, exerted himself to procure a relaxation of the laws against the Catholics. The Dissenters, indeed, to their great credit, saw through the artifice, and refused to accept any advantage that must be purchased by granting the Crown a dispensing power. Was there, indeed, not amply enough to alarm their suspicions? It was now known that King Charles was engaged in a secret treaty with Louis XIV., and the letters of Coleman, Secretary to the Duke of York, in 1675, actually developed a plan “for destroying that pestilent heresy with which the northern parts of Europe were infected,” and described it in another passage “as having a greater prospect of success than any design framed since the time of Queen Mary.” (hear.) Surely all this threw some light on what occurred in 1672. In the secret treaty was an article that pledged Charles II. to a change of the religion he professed. It stated that he was convinced of the truth of the Roman Catholic religion—that he would shortly be reconciled to the church of Rome, and that in case his subjects should rebel, which was not likely, that his Most Christian Majesty should furnish a sum of 200,000l. to his assistance. Here, then, was an instance of a British Monarch proposing to barter away the religion and right of his subjects, and for the sum of 200,000l. He wished only to remind the house, that the chief advisers and instigators of that secret treaty by which the liberties of the country were bartered for 200,000l. (a less sum by half than was now voted for a Caledonian canal or a Penitentiary), were Lord Arlington, Lord Clifford, and Lord Arundel, of Wardour. (hear.) Such being the fact, was it surprising, that independent of the terror the Popish plot might produce, Parliament should feel so much jealousy lest Catholic peers should again become the advisers of the Crown? (hear.) His right hon. friend had dwelt with great force upon, and attached much importance to, an order of the House of Lords made in 1675, and which declared that peerage being an inherent right, no bill should pass which tended to impose a test upon peers. Hence it was inferred, that it could only be under the influence of duress and compulsion, and the effect of some extraordinary terror, that the peers three years afterwards passed the law of exclusion. His right honourable friend, however, had not adverted to the fact, or perhaps he was not aware of its existence, that in that very bill, out of which the order originated, a test was imposed upon peers. True it was, the bill did not pass, but to the latest state the test remained inserted in the bill. The date of 1675 was highly important. It was probably known that the whole history of that act, and of the debates upon it, was given by Mr. Locke, in what was called a letter to or from a person of quality. The act originated among the spiritual lords, and it was especially to exclude from seats those infected with the old leaven of the civil wars. No less than 17 days were occupied upon it, and it was perfectly true that in the course of the debates an order was moved by Lord Shaftesbury to prevent the imposition of tests; yet at the very moment this order was made, the House of Lords did in fact the very thing that was objected to. After the order had been made, the Lord Keeper proposed a test equally applicable to both houses; and in Mr. Locke might be found a protest on the subject, the ground of which was, that it was inconsistent with the order. The Lord Keeper stated, nevertheless, that the house was master of its own orders, and as far as the bill went, it was accompanied by a test, the effect of which would be to exclude Roman Catholic peers. The general history of the motives actuating Lords Shaftesbury, Halifax, and Hollis, to support the order, was given by Burnet, who said that the new

test was opposed by those whom he terms Papists, because they well knew that if there were any precedent of a test, it would be applied to themselves. He added, that Lords Shaftesbury, Halifax, and others, thought it was not right that any test should be imposed upon members of parliament; that peers were appointed by the Crown, and commons elected by the people; and that it was absurd to impose a test that would shut them out from the national deliberations. At the Revolution, the bill passed requiring the declaration against transubstantiation, and altering the oaths of allegiance and supremacy; and if any act of Parliament could in its nature be permanent, permanency ought to belong to those acts passed at the period of the Bill of Rights, when it was declared that James II. had a design to extirpate the Protestant religion, and had been under the direction of evil counsellors and ministers. (hear.) Such was the intention of legislators of that day, and he never could believe, if it were not the intention, that Lord Somers and the other Whigs would in 1705, so soon after the Revolution, have inserted the articles in the Scottish Union, that the peers and commons from thence should necessarily be Protestants, and Protestants only. At the Revolution a view was taken of all the dangers to which the country had been exposed. The Statesman of that day had seen that Charles I. had been under the influence of a Catholic Queen, and that James II. was an avowed Roman Catholic and had endeavoured to subvert the religion of the State, and that Charles II., though in external conformity a member of the established church, did not by that outward compliance afford a sufficient guarantee for the safety of the Church. It was found that he, too, had been influenced by evil counsellors. At the revolution, therefore, provision was made for excluding a Roman Catholic queen from the throne—for preventing Roman Catholic king from presiding over the affairs of the nation, and for shutting out of the councils and the legislature all who were not of the Protestant faith. Ten years after the discoveries of Oates, the Houses of Lords and Commons took these sage precautions; and whether they were right or wrong, they established the Protestant character of Parliament. (hear.) His right hon. friend had referred to two other points; the one was that the summons to Catholic peers to attend the coronation established a peculiar claim in their favour. He (Mr. Peel) confessed that upon this point he had heard his right hon. friend with some surprise and pain. He should have thought that he would have been one of the last to discourage these acts of favour and liberality on the part of the Sovereign, by endeavouring to pervert them into an argument of this kind. If they had been told at once merely that they were excluded from legislation, it was possible that they might have listened with regret, and perhaps with disgust; but if it had been explained to them further, that the constitution was essentially Protestant—that laws had been passed requiring conformity with the church, abjuration of the tenets of Catholicism, and that there was no disposition to extend them further, they might have heard it with patience and acquiescence. He would not give to the Duke of Norfolk and other Catholic peers what the right honourable gent. termed temporary privilege, but he would not exclude them from such honours and personal distinction as the sovereign might think fit to bestow. If in the case of Lord Fingall there was a wish to give a Roman Catholic the full benefit of an honour conferred, he hoped it did not impose the necessity of extending the concession further. Of this he was perfectly certain, that if a Roman Catholic peer had been excluded from a privilege he was qualified to enjoy—if in the case of Lord Fingall it had been contended that he could not receive the honour proposed, on the ground of his faith, the country would never have heard the last of such a glaring instance of obstinate bigotry. (hear, hear.) If he (Mr. Peel) were called upon, he should unquestionably advise the Crown to act upon the principle it had then adopted, and he would not carry the spirit beyond the letter of the law. (hear.) Yet by making such a recommendation, he should assuredly not hold himself precluded from opposing a proposition like that of his right hon. friend, or one of a more enlarged description. His right hon. friend, in the next place, had referred to what he considered a strange state of legislation upon this subject; but would his motion cure any one of the anomalies at present existing? (hear, hear.) Supposing this bill passed, would the condition of a Roman Catholic peer of Ireland be improved? He would be qualified to sit and vote in the House of Peers, and to vote on the election of a representative peer; but if he were chosen by any county or town to sit, as he might, were he not a Roman Catholic, in the House of Commons, he would be turned back because he could not make a declaration from which he was freed in the House of Lords. (hear.) He would put it to any man whether the anomaly was not thus rendered more striking than at present? (hear, hear.) Again he would ask if it were right that a Roman Catholic Peer (the Duke of Norfolk, for instance) should enjoy all the hereditary privileges of his rank and station—should sit and vote in the House of Lords, and advise the Crown upon all matters, and among them *de rebus concernentibus ecclesiam Anglicanum*—would it not indeed be a most strange state of legislation if he were by law not permitted to receive from the Crown the slightest mark of official confidence? (hear, hear.) This was one of the strongest arguments that could be used for postpon-

ing the consideration of the peers (which was all it was necessary for him now to maintain) until the great question relating to the whole Catholic body were brought before the house. He (Mr. Peel) saw around him many who had both supported and opposed the Roman Catholic claims upon perfectly distinct grounds. He presumed that the latter, who on constitutional principles had voted against the admission of Catholics to legislation as a dangerous departure from the law of the land, would resist the motion now before the house. The enemies of general emancipation, as it was termed, would hardly be disposed to admit to another place those who would support the claims of the whole Catholic body, which had hitherto been there effectually resisted. (*hear, hear.*) In conclusion, thanking the house for the indulgence it had already shown (*hear*), he wished to address a few observations to such as had hitherto supported the Roman Catholic claims. There were many, probably a large portion, of the advocates of an extension of privileges, who thought whenever the general subject was discussed and decided, the result should be, to quote the words of his right hon. friends, "a final and conciliatory arrangement." To them the arrangement now proposed could neither be final nor conciliatory. (*hear, hear.*) There were others who thought that whenever the period arrived for removing the disabilities of our Roman Catholic brethren, the whole state of the Roman Catholic Church should be taken into consideration, with a view to some such securities as were enacted in the bill of last session. It had been distinctly urged at that time that measures of concession and security should go hand in hand; and this notion had been supported by the right hon. gent. who introduced the subject. A notice had been given, that within 6 months the whole subject would be introduced; and of those who had supported securities he would ask, whether they thought it wise to pass a partial measure opening one branch of the legislature to Roman Catholics without any securities at all? (*hear.*) What would be the situation of those who should insist on securities hereafter? Would it not be most invidious? A right was given to the Crown to increase the House of Lords, and that without any securities. Yet when Parliament came to consider the case of Catholic members of the House of Commons, whose functions would be only temporary, being elected at most for seven years, if securities were then demanded, would not the situation of those who required them be most painful and invidious? Might not the commoners justly say, that though there can be no doubt of the fidelity and loyalty of the present Duke of Norfolk, or of Lords Clifford and Shrewsbury, yet their posterity, which may not be equally loyal and faithful, is admitted to the privilege of sitting and voting to the latest generation without any attempt to obtain the slightest security. (*hear, hear.*) If no security were required of the aristocracy, chosen by the Crown for more than the period of their lives, it was a little too much to ask security from the commoners, who at most would only sit in Parliament for 7 years. (*hear.*) Besides these classes, there were others who, admitting some remote and possible danger to the constitution, would be disposed to incur it, on account of the present state of Ireland; they contended that the Government of that country rested on too narrow a basis, and that it could not be safe, solid, and permanent, unless the Catholic inhabitants were admitted to the privileges the Protestants enjoyed. Would it advance the views of peace and good order in Ireland, would it show that the interests of the great majority were regarded, to tell them that Roman Catholic peers had been admitted into the House of Lords, but that representatives and guardians for the people were still excluded from the House of Commons? (*hear, hear.*) Other gentlemen had argued this question upon the broadest and most constitutional principles; and at the head of this class was the right hon. member for the University of Dublin. They had taken the most enlarged and comprehensive view, and it could not be explained more fully or more adequately than in the emphatic words of the right hon. gent. himself. He said "I speak in the presence of enlightened constitutional lawyers and statesmen, and I do not fear contradiction when I assert, that the doctrine of exclusion is not to be found in the principles or in the analogies of the constitution. It is not to be found in the history of our country, or in the opinions of any of our statesmen; and it is at once inconsistent with the subject's rights and the King's prerogatives. Ours is a free monarchy, and it is of the essence of such a Government, that the King can call for the services of all his liege subjects, otherwise it is not a monarchy, and no class of subjects can be excluded from privileges, otherwise it is not a free monarchy." He (Mr. Peel) appealed to those who had used or adopted this language, and of them he asked, the time being arrived when it was wise and safe to remove restrictions preventing admission into the House of Lords, if it was just or decent to continue the restrictions to admission into the House of Commons? (*hear, hear.*) If admissibility to office were a general right belonging to all ranks of Roman Catholics, why were the disabilities of the great mass of that body to be postponed to the claims of a few, however respectably founded as those claims were, only upon the same inherent right? All he required (and it formed the whole object of his address) was that the claims of the Roman Catholic peers should be postponed until the whole question, with the securities, were again introduced. He gave his right hon. friend full credit for the best intentions; he was perfectly sure that he fancied there existed in the case of the peers a

peculiarity warranting this distinct motion in their favour, but he was equally certain that it was neither worthy of the great abilities of his right hon. friend, nor of the character of the House, thus, by a partial measure, to give an advantage to the great question, independent of the principles upon which it must rest its pretensions. He had thus attempted to state why he had arrived at a different conclusion from his right hon. friend, and, in order to give effect to his arguments, it was not his intention to move the previous question to secure some stray vote but to meet the motion in the most fair and open manner. (*hear.*) He should pursue now the course in which he had always proceeded on this subject, by giving the proposal his most decided resistance. (*hear, hear.*)

Lord FRANCIS GOWER obtained possession of the house in opposition to several members, who rose at the same time, but the disturbance prevailing in the house prevented us from catching more than two or three sentences. His lordship stated, that when he entered the house he had not intended to address it, but the interest he felt in the success of the motion was so lively and overpowering, that he could not avoid giving it his avowed and public support. He considered it an act of mere justice to the Roman Catholic peers. As to danger, if the Duke of Norfolk and the other noblemen whose interests were so deeply involved were the rankest Jesuits that had ever infested the Escorial or the Inquisition, he should not be apprehensive for the consequences to the country. He thought the fears of those who resisted the Catholic claims generally mere chimerical.

Lord NUGENT said, he entertained certain opinions with respect to the whole question of Catholic emancipation; and, feeling those opinions strongly and conscientiously, he approached the motion of the right honourable gentleman with considerable difficulty. Notwithstanding all the right honourable gentlemen had said, he could not see how, in point of principle, the grounds on which they advanced to this question could be fairly severed from the case of the Roman Catholic body in general. The question was, whether there any longer existed a justification, or semblance of justification, for excluding the Roman Catholics generally, on account of their religious belief, from those civil privileges of which they had been so long deprived? He thought that this subject could stand on no other parliamentary ground with advantage —on none, he was sure, could it be placed so plain and so direct, and he for one might be allowed to say that on none could it be advocated so beneficially in Parliament; because, by stating the question thus generally, it followed that the onus of making out a case of justification was completely thrown on the other side. The cause of those who were favourable to Catholic emancipation stood simply on the showing that the disabilities which affected the Roman Catholics were exceptions from the general spirit of the English law—exceptions from the otherwise undistinguishing doctrines of the British constitution. It appeared to him, on another ground, that the general argument was better than one of a partial description, because it came in a more direct and straight forward way than that which the right honourable gentleman had introduced. He confessed that he was one of those who never could shrink from considering those privileges as matter of strict right and he did so on the ground that, from the moment they could be supported as claims of clear justice, they appeared to him to be claims of clear right. It seemed to him to be necessary that the adversaries of this question should, from time to time, from year to year, point out the existence of some great and still-continuing danger, which justified the exclusion of the Roman Catholics from those privileges to which, in the absence of such a danger, they were entitled. He would not press this point farther on the consideration of the house, except to allude to one of the arguments adduced by the right hon. gent. and which in his (Lord Nugent's) opinion might be pushed to a much greater extent than the right honourable gentleman had thought fit to do. He stated that not only the history of the time, but that the very title of the act under which those disabilities were imposed, proved that it was adopted under circumstances of temporary expediency, and with reference to a temporary necessity. It was an act to secure his Majesty's person and government against a supposed danger; it was an act founded on terror; or, in other words, it was the offspring of a plot. The evidence of the existence of that plot was now, he imagined, believed by very few people; but still the act to which it gave birth was in full force against the Roman Catholics. It was, then, on this broad ground that the Roman Catholics were entitled to the restoration of their rights altogether. They were, it appeared, originally bereaved unjustly of them; and they were now, without any proper or satisfactory cause, withheld. This question could not be reasoned on the principle of expediency. It was a claim of pure justice and right, and the refusal to concede it could only be described by one term—the adherence to wanton and manifest injustice. It was singular enough, that one of those bulwarks or safeguards, as they were called, of the constitution— he meant the declaration against transubstantiation—rejected a doctrine, the truth of which Queen Elizabeth would not suffer to be discussed, in the defence of which Martin Luther wrote a tract, and, by supporting which Henry VIII. obtained the title of Defender of the

PARLIAMENTARY.

—205—

Faith. The Roman Catholics were now called on to abjure, by a declaration on oath, that very doctrine which the first Protestant King of England would have burned his subjects for refusing to subscribe and acknowledge as an article of their religion. If they looked to the 39 Articles, they would also find that this declaration was not at variance with the discipline of the Protestant church; they would perceive, that the declaration, so enacted, and at variance with the 39 Articles, was drawn up for the mere purpose of enabling persons, of a different faith, to accuse, on oath, nine-tenths of all chirstendom of idolatry, and to prevent the Catholic nobility from serving the state of which they were subjects. That was the measure which brought a bar and stigma home to them in their private capacities. They could not be even intrusted with the commission of the peace. And who were the men that were thus excluded? Amongst them were to be found the names of Mowbray, of Fitz-alen, and of Maltavers, the posterity of those who had signed the Great Charter; of Talbot, the descendant of the great man who had twice conquered France, and added her shield to the escutcheon of England; of Norfolk, the Earl Marshal of England, who, though possessed of that elevated and honourable title, was excluded from exercising the most petty jurisdiction. Was it not lamentable that the name of Howard, a name so intimately connected with the glories of England, could not give sanction and validity even to a paltry parish rate? He could not recollect these circumstances? he could not remember that these individuals were descended from some of the most patriotic men this country ever produced, without emotions of sorrow, and he did not envy the feelings of those who could, without regret, contemplate their present situation, oppressed as they were by unjust disabilities. They were the last remnants of our most ancient families—they might classically be called the Representatives of old English nobility; they stood proudly independent amidst the ruin of their privileges, determined to give this up rather than the faith of their fathers: and he need not add, that, to men of such unbending honour, the privations under which they suffered must be severe in the extreme. With respect to the motion which he was particularly called on to discuss, he assured the house that he came to it with more difficulty and hesitation than he recollects to have ever felt on any former question. As to the great cause which this motion was intended to assist, he trusted he need not declare to the house that it would always have his firm and decided support. It was intimately connected with the first principles of justice and liberty, and it had not been shaken by the speech of the right hon. member for Oxford. He did, however, feel certain apprehensions, with reference to the motion now under discussion; and, if he could bring himself to support it, he should do so only on the belief, that, before long, the objectionable parts of this proposition would be merged and lost in the great triumph of justice and liberty, which he confidently anticipated. But he had no hesitation in declaring, if he could suppose that by possibility the law would remain unamended after the passing of the right honourable gentleman's bill, he would, on the whole, prefer the state of the law as it now stood, monstrous and anomalous as it was, and vote against the motion. He would, for this reason, pursue that course; because, singly taken, the right honourable gentleman's measure could do little good; while in some respects it had a tendency to establish an anomalous principle. He had never voted for the Catholic question, except on this great political ground, that every man who fairly discharged the duty of a citizen was fully entitled, whatever his religion might be, to exercise the privileges of a citizen. He applied this principle, not merely to Roman Catholics, but to every other description of Christians. The bill contemplated by the right hon. gent. asserted no such general principle: on the contrary, taken singly, it brought back the law to an anomalous and objectionable state. In the present state of the law, Englishmen were separated from Englishmen—Protestants from Catholics. That separation was founded on the principle of religious difference; but the law which the right hon. gent. endeavoured to introduce would divide Catholic from Catholic, on no just principle which he could conceive. It was, therefore, in the strong hope and full conviction that the great measure would, ere long, be carried, that he would give it his support. One of the rights for which the Roman Catholics called, the right honourable gentleman had kept out of sight, namely, eligibility to seat in that house; a right which appeared to him to be as sacred to a commoner, as was the right of a peer to sit in the other house. The right hon. mover had said, it was without the privity of the noble persons concerned, without their consent being asked, that this proposition had been made. If it were not to obtrude on the house a communication of private friendship, which he was not directed to lay before them, he could quote a disclaimer on this subject, couched in terms that would conciliate the esteem and respect of the right honourable gentleman, from a noble friend of his who was deeply interested in the measure. One word on what he conceived to be the very questionable policy of moving this question. The house must recollect the triumphant issue of the general question of Catholic emancipation, when it was last introduced to them. After three great debates, and four divisions, it was carried. Why did not the house come at once to the general question? Why were

they now confined to a part of the question, when formerly they had carried the whole? Could it be suspected that the house would abandon its own consistency, and give up resolutions to which they were so strongly bound by their former proceedings? Whatever might become of this question, he heartily regretted that it had been brought before them; at the same time he would, under all the circumstances, support it by his vote, though he did so with considerable reluctance.

Mr. WARRE wished to state his reasons for thinking that the arguments which the noble lord who had just sat down had directed against this proposition, were not so conclusive as he seemed to suppose them. The noble lord objected to a partial relief being granted to the Roman Catholics; but there was nothing novel in that circumstance. The noble lord must recollect, that, in 1813, the Catholics were excluded both from the army and navy; but, four years after that period, a most important measure was introduced, which opened both the one and the other to the Roman Catholics. That measure originated with Government, and passed without opposition. At that time, they heard nothing of the impolicy of a partial relief; and he could see no reason for not following up such a precedent. The right hon. member for Oxford combated the proposition on the ground that it was inexpedient for such a measure to originate in the House of Commons. He wished to bring to the hon. member's recollection a measure not directly bearing on this subject, but which, by analogy, might fairly be applied to it. The right hon. member's objection was founded on the impropriety of the House of Commons interfering with the admission of members into the House of Lords. But he begged to remind him of the septennial bill, which related solely to the House of Commons, but which originated in the House of Lords.

Mr. R. MARTIN supported the motion.

A short pause here ensued, and some calls of "question" took place, when

Mr. PLUNKETT presented himself to the house. He did not rise to trouble the house with any length of observation, though he had been alluded to in the speech of his right hon. friend (Mr. Peel). With respect to the grounds on which the motion itself rested, they were so clearly stated and so ably enforced by his right hon. friend (Mr. Canning) who brought it forward, that he (Mr. Plunkett) was not called upon to say one single word on the subject. Under these circumstances, he certainly would have remained silent, had he not felt it necessary, as having the honour of being intrusted with the management of the general measure, to guard against the inference that he was opposed to the more limited relief proposed now to be obtained, or that he thought that such a relief would not affect the people of Ireland. In order to prevent or remove any suspicion of the kind, he felt himself called upon to state publicly, that he heartily concurred in the motion of his right honourable friend. He concurred in it, because it was a step in the general measure which he should have the honour to introduce in the next session, and because it was itself an act of undeniable and substantial right and justice. (hear, hear.) Last session, when the great question was before the house in all its parts and bearings—with all its qualifications and securities, considerable embarrassments were thrown in the way of those who supported it. It was finally carried, and received the sanction of this house; but, during its progress, it was involved in multifarious details, and accompanied by guards and securities which endangered its success. He (Mr. Plunkett) did not complain that it was unfairly dealt with in the opposition which it received from his right honourable friend (Mr. Peel); but that opposition, joined to the complexity of its details, occasioned its friends considerable embarrassment. Some of those members who supported the measure anticipated so little danger that they objected to the securities, while others thought all securities insufficient. It was therefore to him a great source of satisfaction to see a measure introduced so distinct, so clear, so well defined, so little liable to misconstruction, and so little connected with danger, as to relieve its friends from all those embarrassments. (hear, hear.) Nothing could be more simple than the object of his right hon. friend. He (Mr. Canning) proposed to repeal a part of an act which excluded a few Irish and British peers from their seats in the upper house, and to restore them to the enjoyment of this privilege. Those peers had been restored to the privilege of approaching their sovereign, and giving him advice in managing the affairs of the nation, and the intended measure would only enable them to defend in their places in Parliament the advice which they had privately given. (hear.) No objection had been stated to the justice or the expediency of the general measure—no apprehensions of danger had been uttered at concession—no attempt had been made to show that it would be *beatoe* on the unworthy. It had been opposed only on points of etiquette, and the debate upon it had been turned to disputed portions of history. It was said that the motion ought not to be agreed to, because the concession here obtained would only lay the ground for additional demand, and because this was a partial measure, preparatory to the general measure. This was no objection to those who had brought forward and carried the general measure in this house last year, and who had not concealed that it was intended next session again to submit

it to the consideration of Parliament. He (Mr. Plunkett) would be glad that, before the general measures should be again submitted to the other house, where it had been last year, those who sat in it should be called upon as men, as gentlemen, (*hear*), and men of honour, to receive among them those peers who had originally been unjustly deprived of their privileges, or to state the grounds, in law and justice, of their continued exclusion. He hoped that when these peers knocked at the door of their house for admission, those who opposed their entrance would be able to state the principle of right and justice on which they acted, and would not sanction rules which would place their own valued privileges and hereditary distinctions at the mercy of some Titus Oates of after-times. (*loud cries of "hear."*) This measure of justice was to reverse an act of attainder passed on the evidence of the most infamous of mankind, and in circumstances of alarm which had now for ever disappeared. The least attention to these circumstances would show the injustice of the exclusion. The cause of it was not that the Catholic peers were dangerous counsellors, but because the House of Commons, in the reign of Charles II., suspected the King of being a Catholic—a fact which, though unknown at the time, was afterwards ascertained to be the case—and dreaded a Catholic successor to the throne. (*hear, hear.*) It was certain that if a bill of exclusion against the latter could have passed, this bill of attainder against the peers would never have passed. What, then, was done? The innocent had been proscribed and punished because an exclusion bill could not be carried. The guiltless were attainted because the proper object of attack could not be reached. (*hear, hear.*) His right honourable friend (Mr. Peel) had said that it was not alone the fear of a Popish succession, on the alarm of a Popish plot which had led the parliament of the reign of Charles II. to pass the act which the motion was intended to repeal, but that for a long time a just distrust was entertained of the Catholics, and a plot was going forward to subvert the liberties and change the religion of the country by foreign aid—that an alliance had been formed with the court of France for this object, and that the Roman Catholics were ready to second any invasion of their country which might enable them to regain their lost power. He (Mr. Plunkett) admitted that the Catholics of that day were not well affected to a Protestant state, or to the Protestant throne. Nor could they be expected to be so. He admitted other causes of suspicion against them existed than the fable of the Popish plot. Be it allowed that they were disaffected then—the question was, were they so now? This recurrence to history would be found to contain the strongest argument for the motion; for if the spirit of the Catholics now was so different from what it had been then, why apply the same rule to both—on what ground continue an exclusion against a loyal and well-affected peer, which had been obtained against his disloyal and disaffected ancestor—on what ground enforce an act which passed when doubts existed of a Protestant succession and of rebellion, when the ascriptions to the throne insecure, and disaffection no longer existed? But his honourable friend (Mr. Peel) had not felt secure on resting on the history of Charles the Second's reign—he had gone down to the Revolution, and appealed to the principles then sanctioned, as support to his own views. He begged leave to set his right hon. friend right on some of these points. The laws again the Catholics, to which he had alluded, formed no part of the Revolution, they formed no part of the Bill of Rights; the last act was not mentioned in the Bill of Rights. The amended oath of supremacy was excluded in that, because it was intended, by setting it forth at full, to show the difference between that oath and the oath of the same name framed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. When the Revolution was appealed to as a sanction to measures of a penal and partial character, or on questions of this kind, he (Mr. Plunkett) professed that he did not know what was meant. (*hear.*) Was it meant that all the acts which preceded, accompanied, or followed the revolution, were parts of the revolution? If they were, then the repeal of the penal laws against Catholics, and the relaxation of various statutes for admitting them to civil privileges, had made great inroads on the "glorious" revolution. (*hear.*) According to this principle, the law that deprived the Catholic of the superintendence of his own children's education, the law that prohibited him from acquiring property, the law that banished him to within six miles of the palace of Westminster, were all parts of the glorious Revolution. In short, the 10th and 11th of William, with all its injustice and cruelty, were parts of the Revolution. By that statute, saying mass was punishable with perpetual imprisonment; the Catholic was to forfeit his estate to his nearest Protestant relation, unless he abjured his faith, and he was subjected to many other persecutions. When the glorious Revolution was considered as giving a sanction to acts like these, it might be of use to inquire into the history of this statute. It was given by Bishop Burnet, but he would read it in the language of Mr. Burke:—"A party in the nation, enemies to the system of the Revolution, were then in opposition to the Government of King William. They knew that our glorious deliverer was an enemy to all persecution. They knew that he came to free us from slavery and popery out of a country where a third of the people are contended Catholics under a Protestant Govern-

ment. He came with a part of his army composed of those very Catholics to overset the power of a Popish Prince. Such is the effect of a tolerating spirit, and so much is liberty served in every way, and by all persons, by a manly adherence to its own principles. Whilst freedom is true to itself, every thing becomes subject to it, and its very adversaries are an instrument in its hands. This party resolved to make the King either violate his principles of toleration, or incur the odium of protecting Papists. They therefore brought in this bill, and made it purposely wicked and absurd, that it might be rejected. The then court party discovering their game, turned the tables on them, and returned their bill studded with still greater absurdities, that its loss might lie on its original authors. They finding their own ball thrown back upon them, kicked it back again upon their adversaries. And thus this act, loaded with the double injustice of two parties, neither of whom intended to pass what they hoped the other would be persuaded to reject, went through the legislature contrary to the wish of all parts of it, and of all the parties who composed it. In this manner, those insolent and profligate factions, as if they were playing with balls and counters, made a sport of the fortunes and liberties of their fellow creatures." Now all this was done in the glorious Revolution. But the glorious Revolution was at an end if it consisted of this statute as one of its component parts, for it had been repealed long ago, and the argument of his right honourable friend would better have been employed in 1791 than now. If, then, the laws which preceded and followed the Revolution were not parts of it, why should we be restrained from doing an act of right and justice by an appeal to it. The principles of the Revolution did not require the exclusion of any class of the people from civil privileges, on account of religious opinions. The Protestant religion he (Mr. Plunkett) allowed had had a great influence in establishing the Hanoverian succession, but it was the spirit of freedom which was the cause of both. He (Mr. Plunkett) did not feel disposed to go at length into the history of religion in this country, but he would just observe, that the Reformation arose not so much from a dislike to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic church, either by Henry VIII., as from resistance to the exactions of the court of Rome: and during the reign of the Stuarts, the Protestant religion was always joined with freedom to oppose popery and arbitrary power. If the Protestant establishment could only be preserved by the maintenance of principles which would exclude great classes of the people from civil privileges, the price would certainly be great. Mr. Burke, no enemy to the establishment, had truly observed, "I cannot conceive how any thing worse can be said of the Protestant religion of the Church of England than this, that, wherever it is established, it becomes necessary to deprive the body of the people of their liberties, and to reduce them to a state of civil servitude." This was not necessary in his (Mr. Plunkett's) opinion; the safety of the establishment could be easily reconciled with the admission of persons, professing another religion, to civil rights. He would, therefore, support the motion as a great measure of justice. He would have supported it, though it had included only one peer. Every instance of exclusion, every hour of delay in admitting them to their rights, was an injustice—while every concession was an act of conciliation and justice. It had been objected, that this measure, which affected the other house, should begin in this. This objection must be stated on the part of the other house, but it had not been acted upon last year, when a bill was thrown out in that house which affected the Commons. When a joint bill was sent up, it was rejected because a joint bill—when a separate bill should be sent up, it would be rejected as a separate bill: there never would be wanting pretext for rejecting. The right honourable gentleman, after some other observations, which we have not time or room for reporting, concluded by warmly supporting the motion.

Mr. WETHERELL, as soon as he became audible in the gallery, was understood to say, that no man before had initiated a partial measure upon this subject. According to this measure, the proposition of Mr. Pitt, that no concession should be made unless it could be qualified with commensurate security, would be abandoned. This bill was like the bill presented to Dr. Johnson in the Hebrides, which had no edibles or liquids, but only provisions. This was a perfect book of provisions. Next sessions Catholic commoners would expect to be admitted, *pari passu*, without restrictions. After the peers and the commons were so admitted, what would the church say to the *reto*? He would rather have the measure in *toto*, than in this mutilated form. His opinion retrograded by the attempt now made. (*cheers.*) He was not disposed to measure spears with the right hon. gent. (Mr. Canning,) but he would say, that of all extraordinary bills his was the acme and perfection of unrivalled singularity. (*cheers.*) No man had before proposed to confer the right of election without security. In 1823 the right hon. gent. might not have it in his power to advocate the general measure, and therefore it was that he brought forward this portion of it in 1822. (great murmuring and coughing, which continued during the remainder of the honourable gentleman's speech.)

Mr. CANNING said, that after the full measure of indulgence which he had already received, he did assure the house that it was not his in-

tention to avail himself of the privilege usually conceded to him who brought forward a motion; but some things which his right hon. friend the Secretary for the Home Department, and some things which the hon. and learned gent. who had just sat down, had said, he could not pass over without observation and reply. He had been accused, not only of impolicy, but of imprudence in bringing this part of the measure forward alone. His right hon. friend, the Secretary, with great anxiety for the general measure (*cheers*), and with confident anticipation of its success, (*loud cheers*), seemed to be alarmed at his (Mr. Canning's) defeating his own purpose and retarding his own object. (*hear, hear.*) But since his right hon. friend would have the whole measure, and anticipated success, he (Mr. Canning) had only to advert to one or two points in which he had been misunderstood. It had been said there had been but one single precedent of the Commons having interfered with the Lords, and that that had been for the exclusion of the Bishops. Now he appealed to the house, whether the act of the 13th Charles II. had not undone the mischief of that interference in the time of Charles I. He would also appeal to the house respecting the 6th Elizabeth, whether its intention had not been to obtain the oath of supremacy, and whether the exclusion from the Commons had not been merely a means of compelling the taking of that oath. (*hear, hear.*) The 30th of Charles II. applied a test only to the Commons. The House of Peers had then no test and no difficulty of that kind interposed. The two houses had been in different situations. Therefore, he must assume that the same thing, applied to unequal things, did not produce an equal operation. (*hear, hear.*) But if the house interfered to the disadvantage of the Lords—if they did injustice formerly, they ought to repair it now. (*cheers*) With respect to the rights of the peerage, was he to be referred to the union of Scotland and Ireland? Those acts he had always regarded as wholly out of the landmarks of the constitution. Not that he blamed those acts, but he contended that they were not applicable to a justly organized constitution. Those countries had given up their whole legislature, and merged them in another country. That circumstance touched not at all the six peers unjustly excluded from the other house of Parliament. He admitted that nothing could be more anomalous than the power of an Irish peer to renounce his rank and become a commoner, or to retain it and become one of the Lords. But that could not be argued to form any barrier to this measure. His proposal was that peers should take their seats as before the act of Charles the second. The Irish union, singularly enough, had provided respecting the oaths of representative peers in these terms—"The oaths now taken, or that shall hereafter be taken," (*hear, hear.*); they would mark that (*cheers*). And in like manner the expression respecting a peer voting for a representative peer was—"That oath taken, or that shall be taken." (*loud cheers*). It was a little singular, that this cautious proviso for change should have been introduced into the articles of the Irish union, if, as the right honourable secretary supposed, it was essential and fundamental to the Protestant constitution that the oaths should not be changed. On what principle was it possible to imagine that the concurrent legislatures of England and Ireland should have provided for the possibility of the change of the oaths, which in their consciences they believed ought to be as immortal as the constitution, if their opinion of that immortality were not different from that of his right hon. friend (*a laugh*); if, in short they did not contemplate that at some, and no very distant period, other oaths would be proposed? (*hear.*) It was true, as stated by his right honourable friend, that, with respect to the union with Scotland, it was not in the parts of the articles proposed by England, and for which we were responsible, but in the parts stipulated by Scotland, that the word "Protestant" was introduced in a way which debarred all alteration. Without repealing the Scottish part of the articles of the union which we had adopted we could not open to the Scotch Catholics the road to admission to the British legislature. As this country was the stronger party, we ought not, in his opinion, to originate any change in what Scotland considered as a fundamental part of the union. He was sure that the House would agree with him in thinking that the Scotch nation had not acted consistently with its character for prudence and foresight in framing the articles of union. Ireland, upon the same occasion, had exhibited much more prudence. Let the house decide the present question on its own merits. If the house were of opinion that the Catholic Peers had been justly excluded from the legislature, that the safety of the state required it, let them say so. The only question that would remain would be, whether that exclusion ought to descend to posterity. He was sure there was not an individual, who upon entering that house for the first time did not feel regret that the first step which should be considered necessary to qualify him for legislating should be the making of a declaration of abhorrence of the religious tenets of millions of his fellow-subjects, towards whose happiness he was bound to contribute. In discoursing with persons of the religion which was considered so obnoxious, he had always found them speak in praise of the beauties of the constitution. His right hon. friend would say to an individual of this description—"Yes, but amidst all your praises of the positive charms of the constitution, you have forgot its secret talisman." "What is

that?" the Catholic would ask. "It is your exclusion;" was the reply. That not only augmented all the positive charms of the constitution, but secured them from violation. In another part of his right hon. friend's speech, he seemed to think that he (Mr. Canning) had under-rated the danger to which the Protestant cause was exposed in the reign of Charles II. He was willing to admit all that the right honourable gentleman had stated upon that subject. He believed that a more profligate or corrupt monarch than Charles II. never sat upon the throne. He was bent upon destroying the liberties of the country, and introducing slavery. He was secretly attached to Popery, while he openly professed Protestantism and history related that he went to a Catholic and a Protestant chapel on one and the same day, and received the communion at both. He was a bigot at the commencement of his reign, and a tyrant at its conclusion. But all this and much more, which he was willing to concede, would make against and not for the argument of his right hon. friend. When we looked at the reign of Charles II., it might appear that there was ground for the measures which had been adopted against the Catholics, but it offered no excuse for their continuation now. Those measures arose out of circumstances not similar to, but contrasted with, the circumstances of the present moment. He really thought that, with the exception of the fears of Titus Oates, the fears which his right hon. friend had expressed as to the consequences likely to result from the admission of Catholic peers into the House of Lords were the most unreasonable that could be. Unless his right hon. friend were prepared to show that the circumstances which existed in the reign of Charles II. of a secret Popish King and an avowed Popish heir presumptive to the throne, and a ministry willing to join in any plot for the destruction of the Protestant religion, and the subversion of liberty, existed now, his distant and visionary fears might be adjourned with the remainder of his speech. If the measure which he had projected should be carried, it would be, as the Attorney General for Ireland had said, a great act of public justice—a repentance of the shedding of innocent blood, and an atonement of past insult: it would equal the hopes which he had dared to entertain, and it would surpass the expectations of more important persons.

The house then divided, when the members were—

Ayes.....	249
Noes.....	244
Majority for the motion	5

The other orders of the day were disposed of, and the house adjourned at one o'clock.

Newspapers.

The MORNING CHRONICLE of Saturday (May 11), contains the following statement, in refutation of Mr. Hume's assertion, that the sale of THE TIMES equalled any other two daily Papers:—

"Amount of stamp duty by CHRONICLE, as per	
Stamp Office return,	£ 10,500
Amount of stamp duty by COURIER,	23,775
	43,075

Amount of duty paid by THE TIMES independent of	
the MAIL, as published in the THE TIMES of the	
29th ultimo,	32,084

Difference, 10,901," which the CHRONICLE asserts, that the COURIER and themselves have paid above THE TIMES.

The above erroneous statement is founded on the following fact, viz. that the returns made by the Stamp Office to the House of Commons, of the amount of duty paid by each Paper, is the gross amount of the several numbers of stamps, at 4d. each, without deducting the 20 per cent. discount allowed to all Papers which sell at 7d.; so that the amount stated exceeds the actual amount paid by one-fifth. The statement published by THE TIMES was the net amount, after deducting the discount.

The following statement is therefore the correct one:—

Amount of duty returned as paid by the COURIER, for	
1821,	£ 26,575
Discount,	5,315

Duty paid by the CHRONICLE, as per return,	16,500
Discount,	3,300

Duty actually paid,	34,460
Duty actually paid by THE TIMES in the same year, as stated in that journal of the 29th ultimo,	32,084

Real difference only,	2,376
-----------------------------	-------

The CHRONICLE and COURIER have therefore jointly sold about 500 a day, more than THE TIMES.

Office of the Times, May 11, 1822.

W. WATKINS.

Chowringhee Theatre.

The performance of DON FELIX, on Friday night, must have satisfied the highest expectations that could have been entertained, and confirmed the general opinion that the services of this gentleman are the greatest acquisition the Chowringhee Theatre has made for several years. He is now, and we hope will long continue, one of its main Corinthian pillars. The gracefulness and propriety of his action, and the fine animation of his delivery are such as to leave little to desiderate, and to prove that that little will certainly and speedily be supplied by practice. The best actor is he who with great advantages and talents displays his intelligence and tact by continual improvement, not he who discovers all at once the utmost of his histrionic powers. DON FELIX has now only to addit himself to a careful study of his author, in the varied walk that is open to him, and every thing will follow.

Of Colonel BRITON one can only repeat that he did for his part (a poor part for him) all that the most accomplished actor could do. DON LOPEZ and DON PEDRO were correctly and efficiently personated. The Representative of LISSARDO threw into it all the humour of which it is susceptible. On the departure of this excellent actor it will be necessary to look about for the next best in his line, for it will not be easy to find his equal. The part of VIOLANTE was sustained with much spirit and feeling, and the other performers contributed in their several degrees to the success which crowned the whole.

In this bustling hole-and-corner play there lies a notable moral. It admirably illustrates the tendency of unjust restraints, and a tyrannical exercise of authority, to excite the desire and suggest the means of counteraction; and strikingly demonstrates what an unequal war they wage against the resources of their intended victims, and the sympathies of all the world.—From a Critic in the *Pit*.

Selections.

Weather.—The weather for the last three days has been very wet and uncomfortable; and judging from the long and heavy falls of rain, we suspect that the rainy season is about to terminate. Calcutta at this juncture, is not more unhealthy than it generally is about the turn of the year. An alarm prevailed respecting Cholera, but we conceive that it was groundless. A few Spasmodic cases may have prevailed among the Natives in the suburbs, but we have heard of no well attested cases even among them; and of only one fatal case among the European population. Cholera, as an epidemic, we trust, has disappeared, and will not return again for a long time. At any rate, an occasional fatal-case ought not so be conjured up into a bugbear of general apprehension, for dread frequently becomes fate. Though it is worse than idle to harp on anticipated evil, and even to bring it on by anticipation, it is very right to be prepared against the malady as much as human means can admit of. Those who are well housed and properly clothed, and who lead temperate lives, if they have a vial of Laudanum and Ether, and a bottle of Brandy in the house, are as physically well prepared as people generally can be against a sudden attack. Whatever tends to disorder the stomach, the bowels, or the liver, predisposes to Cholera. The best surety against it, then, is prudence, and tact as respects dietetics and general regimen. Sleeping in a current of air and exposure to the sun, ought, at this peculiar season, to be strictly avoided; as also indulgence in raw vegetables, or large draughts of cold liquid.

Phil-harmonic Concerts.—We have not heard whether any movement has been made in the fashionable world towards getting up Assemblies or Conversations for the cold season. We cannot, therefore, give any information on that head to the dashing Cavaliers and charming Spinster of this City. It gives us great pleasure, however, to assure the musically inclined, that the most exquisite entertainments on a grand scale are in store for them. Mr. LINTON, as may have been observed by the advertisements, has already taken the field under the banner of Euterpe. We understand that his preparations for the Phil-harmonic Concerts are of the most splendid kind. The Orchestra is to be on the Stage, and will be so arranged as to produce the most agreeable and picturesque effect upon the eyes of the Spectators in the Pit and Boxes. The whole of the instrumental abilities of the place, we learn, will be brought into action, as well as the vocal, with exceptions which we sincerely wish did not exist. Taking all these circumstances, and the moderate rate of subscription, (only One Rupee for a Pit, and Two Rupees for Box Ticket above the usual admission price of the Theatre) into consideration, we trust Mr. Linton will reap those advantage from his excellent plan which his abilities so richly merit. We cannot conclude without expressing our regret at not finding the names of Mr. and Mrs. Lacy in the scheme of the Phil-harmonic Concerts. There cannot be a doubt that it is the wish of the public to see all the vocal as well as instrumental talents of Calcutta united in one Orchestra. For this purpose a meeting is actually to be convened at the Town Hall, on Tuesday next, in the forenoon. May we not hope that the object of the meeting will be successful?—*India Gazette*, September 12.

Mehmandar.—Captain Macan, Persian Secretary to His Excellency the Commander in Chief, is appointed Mehmendar to the Persian Prince, Futtah Olah Khan, who arrived yesterday on the Ship VOLUNTEER.

Iron Bridge.—Sometime ago we announced the intended suspension of an Iron Bridge, on the part of Government at Kalee Ghant, over Tolly's Nullah. We are now happy to intimate that the work is in a great state of forwardness and will soon be completed. The Iron work is finished; and it remains only to put its various pieces together. The masonry of the piers is also built, and the road leading up to them is the only portion of the undertaking remaining in a backward state. The width of the Iron frame is between eight and nine feet; and the Bridge will, we hear, hang higher by several feet than either of the Bridges at Alieapore and Kiddepore.—*John Bull*, September 13.

Shipping Arrivals.

CALCUTTA.

Date	Names of Vessels	Flags	Commanders	From Whence	Left
Sept. 14	Geo. the Fourth	British	J. W. Clarke	London	Apr. 22
14	Thetis	British	C. F. Davies	Bombay	Aug. 18
14	Zohanne Maria	Danish	H. Duntzfelt	Copenhagen	—

Stations of Vessels in the River.

CALCUTTA, SEPTEMBER 13, 1822.

At Diamond Harbour.—GEORGE CRUTTENDEN, and MARY ANN, inward-bound, remain,—CLYDE, on her way to Town,—JULIANA, KENT, and SULTAN, outward-bound, remain,—VALTTA, passed up,—ELEANOR, CERES, and HENRY, (F.) passed down.

Kedgeroe.—DOLPHIN (bark), outward-bound, remains.

New Anchorage.—H. C. Ships PRINCE REGENT, and ASIA,—ST. THIAGO MAIOR, (P.)—JOHN SHORE.

Saugor.—H. C. S. DUCHESS OF ATHOLL, JAMES SCOTT, CAROLINE (brig), RANGOON PACKET (brig), LA CLAHISSE (F.) EDMOND (F.), AJAX, and HORATIO (brig), outward-bound, remain.

The OSFRAY, WILLIAM MONEY, HERCULES, and PASCOA, arrived off Calcutta on Friday.

On the 10th instant, the THETIS spoke the French Ship PENELOPE, bound to Calcutta, off False Point.

Passengers.

Passengers per CERES, from Calcutta to Madras.—Madame Pelegrin, Madame D'Atselme, Miss Collins, and J. F. Holland, Esq.

Vessels in the River.

Statement of Shipping in the River Hooghly, on the 1st of September 1822.

	Vessels	Tons.
Honorable Company's Surveying Vessel,	1	500
Honorable Company's Ships,	2	2312
Free Traders, for Great Britain,	10	4804
Country Ships for ditto,	7	4461
Ships and Vessels employed in the Country Trade,	10	2742
Laid up for Sale or Freight,	18	7106
French Vessels,	2	962
American Vessels,	9	2705
Portuguese Vessels,	4	1930
Dutch Vessel,	1	149
Arabian Vessel,	1	360
Total,	65	28982
Free Traders in the River, on the 1st of Sept. 1821,	13	5839
Ditto ditto, on the 1st of Sept. 1822,	10	4804
Decrease,	3	1035

Marriage.

On the 14th instant, at St. John's Cathedral, by the Reverend D. CORRIE, Mr. THOMAS FRISBY, to Miss MARY ANN MARCHAND.

Births.

At Futtighor, on the 1st instant, the Lady of Captain A. SMITH, 25th Regiment of Native Infantry, of a Son.

At Madras, on the 22d ultimo, the Wife of Mr. P. KUTCHICK, of a Daughter.

Death.

On the 9th instant, Master JAMES SCOTT, aged 12 years.

